On the energy critical Schrodinger equation in 3D non-trapping domains

Oana Ivanovici, Fabrice Planchon

On the energy critical Schrödinger equation in $3D$ non-trapping domains

Oana Ivanovici *
Universite Paris-Sud, Orsay,
Mathematiques, Bat. 430, 91405 Orsay Cedex, France
oana.ivanovici@math.u-psud.fr

Fabrice Planchon †
Laboratoire Analyse, Géométrie & Applications, UMR 7539 du CNRS,
Institut Galilée, Université Paris 13,
99 avenue J.B. Clément, F-93430 Villetaneuse
fab@math.univ-paris13.fr

Abstract

We prove that the quintic Schrödinger equation with Dirichlet boundary conditions is locally well posed for $H_0^1(\Omega)$ data on any smooth, non-trapping domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$. The key ingredient is a smoothing effect in $L_x^5(L_t^2)$ for the linear equation. We also derive scattering results for the whole range of defocusing subquintic Schrödinger equations outside a star-shaped domain.

1 Introduction

The Cauchy problem for the semilinear Schrödinger equation in $\mathbb{R}^3$ is by now relatively well-understood: after seminal results by Ginibre-Velo [10] in the energy class for energy subcritical equations, the issue of local well-posedness in the critical Sobolev spaces $(\dot H^{\frac{3}{2}-\frac{2}{p-1}})$ was settled in [7]. Scattering for large time was proved in [10] for energy subcritical defocusing equations, while the energy critical (quintic) defocusing equation was only recently successfully tackled in [9]. The local well-posedness relies on Strichartz estimates, while scattering results combine these local results with suitable non concentration arguments based on Morawetz type estimates. On domains, the same set of problems remains

*The first author was partially supported by grant A.N.R.-07-BLAN-0250
†The second author was partially supported by A.N.R. grant ONDE NON LIN

an elusive target, due to the difficulty in obtaining Strichartz estimates in such a setting. In [2], the authors proved Strichartz estimates with an half-derivative loss on non trapping domains: the non trapping assumption is crucial in order to rely on the local smoothing estimates. However, the loss resulted in well-posedness results for strictly less than cubic nonlinearities; this was later improved to cubic nonlinearities in [1] (combining local smoothing and semiclassical Strichartz near the boundary) and in [11] (on the exterior of a ball, through precised smoothing effects near the boundary). Recently there were two significant improvements, following different strategies:

- in [16], Luis Vega and the second author obtain an $L^4_{t,x}$ Strichartz estimate which is scale invariant. However, one barely misses $L^4_t(L^\infty(\Omega))$ control for H^1_0 data, and therefore local wellposedness in the energy space was improved to all subcritical (less than quintic) nonlinearities, but combining this Strichartz estimate with local smoothing close to the boundary and the full set of Strichartz estimates in $\mathbb{R}^3$ away from it. Scattering was also obtained for the cubic defocusing equation, but the lack of a good local wellposedness theory at the scale invariant level ($\dot H^{\frac{1}{2}}$) led to a rather intricate incremental argument, from scattering in $\dot H^{\frac{1}{4}}$ to scattering in H^1_0;
- in [13], the first author proved the full set of Strichartz estimates (except for the endpoint) outside stricly convex obstacles, by following the strategy pioneered in [17] for the wave equation, and relying on the Melrose-Taylor parametrix. In the case of the Schrödinger equation, one obtains Strichartz estimates on a semiclassical time scale (taking advantage of a finite speed of propagation principle at this scale), and then upgrading to large time results from combining them with the smoothing effect (see [3] for a nice presentation of such an argument, already implicit in [19]). Therefore, one obtains the exact same local wellposedness theory as in the $\mathbb{R}^3$ case, including the quintic nonlinearity, and scattering holds for all subquintic defocusing nonlinearities, taking advantage of the a priori estimates from [16].

In the present work, we aim at providing a local wellposedness theory for the quintic nonlinearity outside non trapping obstacles, a case which is not covered by [13]. From explicit computations with gallery modes ([12]), one knows that the full set of optimal Strichartz estimates does not hold for the Schrödinger equation on a domain whose boundary has at least one geodesically convex point; while this does not preclude a scale invariant Strichartz estimate with a loss (like the $L^4_t(L^\infty_x)$ estimate in $\mathbb{R}^3$ which is enough to solve the quintic NLS), it suggests to bypass the issue and use a different set of estimates, which we call smoothing estimates: in $\mathbb{R}^3$, these estimates may be stated as follows,

$$\|\exp(it\Delta)f\|_{L^4_x(L^2_t)} \lesssim \|f\|_{\dot H^{-\frac{1}{4}}}, \tag{1.1}$$

from which one can infer various estimates by using Sobolev in time and/or in space. Formally, (1.1) is an immediate consequence of the Stein-Tomas restriction theorem in $\mathbb{R}^3$ (or, more accurately, its dual version, on the extension): let $\tau > 0$ be a fixed radius, one sees $\hat{f}(\xi)$ as a function on $|\xi| = \sqrt{\tau}$, and applies the extension estimate, with δ the Dirac function and $\mathcal{F}$ the space Fourier transform

$$\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}(\delta(\tau - |\xi|^2)\hat{f}(\xi))\|_{L^4_x} \lesssim \|\hat{f}(\xi)\|_{L^2(|\xi|=\sqrt{\tau})}.$$

Summing over τ yields the L^2 norm of f on the RHS, while on the left we use Plancherel in time and Minkowski to get (1.1). A similar estimate holds for the wave equation, replacing $\sqrt{\tau} = |\xi|$ by $\tau = \pm|\xi|$, and usually goes under the denomination of square function (in time) estimates. In a compact setting (e.g. compact manifolds) a substitute for the Stein-Tomas theorem is provided by L^p eigenfunction estimates, or better yet, spectral cluster estimates. In the context of a compact manifold with boundaries, such spectral cluster estimates were recently obtained by Smith and Sogge in [18], and provided a key tool for solving the critical wave equation on domains, see [4, 6]. In this paper, we apply the same strategy to the Schrödinger equation:

- we derive an $L^5(\Omega; L^2_I)$ smoothing estimate for spectrally localized data on compact manifolds with boundaries, from the spectral cluster $L^5(\Omega)$ estimate; here I is a time interval whose size is such that $|I||\sqrt{-\Delta_D}| \sim 1$;

- we decompose the solution to the linear Schrödinger equation on a non trapping domain into two main regions: close to the boundary, where we can view the region as embedded into a $3D$ punctured torus, to which the previous semi-classical estimate may be applied, and then sumed up using the local smoothing effect; and far away from the boundary where the $\mathbb{R}^3$ estimates hold.

- Finally, we patch together all estimates to obtain an estimate which is valid on the whole exterior domain. Local wellposedness in the critical Sobolev space $\dot{H}^{\frac{3}{2}-\frac{2}{p-1}}$ immediatly follows for $3+2/5 < p \leq 5$, and together with the a priori estimates from [16], this implies scattering for the defocusing equation for $3 + 2/5 < p < 5$. The remaining range $3 \leq p \leq 3 + 2/5$ is sufficiently close to 3 that, as alluded to in [16], a suitable modification of the arguments from [16] yields scattering as well.

Remark 1.1. *Clearly, such smoothing estimates are better suited to large values of p: the restriction $3 + 2/5 < p$ for the critical wellposedness is directly linked to the exponent 5 in the spectral cluster estimates; in $\mathbb{R}^3$, where the correct (and optimal !) exponent is 4, one may solve down to $p = 3$ by this method, while the Strichartz estimates allow to solve at scaling level all the way to the L^2 critical value $p = 1 + 4/3$.*

2 Statement of results

Let Θ be a compact, non-trapping obstacle in $\mathbb{R}^3$ and set $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \Theta$. By Δ_D we denote the Laplace operator with constants coefficients on Ω. For $s \in \mathbb{R}$, $p, q \in [1, \infty]$ we denote by $\dot{B}^{s,q}_p(\Omega) = \dot{B}^{s,q}_p$ the Besov spaces on Ω, where the spectral localization in their definition is meant to be with respect to Δ_D. We write $L^p_x = L^p(\Omega)$ and $\dot{H}^\sigma = \dot{B}^{s,2}_2$ for the Lebesgue and Sobolev spaces on Ω. It will be useful to introduce the Banach-valued Besov spaces $\dot{B}^{s,q}_p(L^r_t)$, and we refer to the Appendix for their definition. Whenever L^p_t is replaced by L^p_T, it is meant that the time integration is restricted to the interval $(-T, T)$.

We aim at studying wellposedness for the energy critical equation on $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}$, with Dirichlet boundary condition,

$$i\partial_t u + \Delta_D u = \pm |u|^4 u, \quad u_{|\partial\Omega} = 0, \quad u_{|t=0} = u_0 \tag{2.1}$$

and more generally

$$i\partial_t u + \Delta_D u = \pm |u|^{p-1} u, \quad u_{|\partial\Omega} = 0, \quad u_{|t=0} = u_0 \tag{2.2}$$

with $p < 5$.

Theorem 2.1. *(Well-posedness for the quintic Schrödinger equation) Let $u_0 \in H^1_0(\Omega)$. There exists $T(u_0)$ such that the quintic nonlinear equation (2.1) admits a unique solution $u \in C([-T, T], H^1_0(\Omega)) \cap \dot{B}^{1,2}_5(L^{\frac{20}{11}}_T)$. Moreover, the solution is global in time and scatters in H^1_0 if the data is small.*

The previous theorem extends to the following subcritical range:

Theorem 2.2. *Let $3 + \frac{2}{5} < p < 5$, $s_p = \frac{3}{2} - \frac{2}{p-1}$ and $u_0 \in \dot{H}^{s_p}$. There exists $T(u_0)$ such that the nonlinear equation (2.2) admits a unique solution $u \in C([-T, T], \dot{H}^{s_p}) \cap \dot{B}^{s_p,2}_5(L^{\frac{20}{11}}_T)$. Moreover the solution is global in time and scatters in $\dot{H}^{s_p}$ if the data is small.*

Remark 2.1. *We elected to state both theorems for Dirichlet boundary conditions mostly for sake of simplicity. Indeed, both results hold with Neuman boundary conditions: the key ingredients for our linear estimates are known to hold for Neuman, see [18, 2], while the nonlinear mappings from our appendix rely on [14] (where all relevant estimates can be proved to hold in the Neuman case).*

Finally, we consider the long time asymptotics for (2.2) in the defocusing case, namely the + sign on the left; in this situation, we are indeed restricted to the Dirichlet boundary conditions, as we rely on a priori estimates from [16].

Theorem 2.3. *Assume the domain Ω to be the exterior of a star-shaped compact obstacle (which implies Ω is non trapping). Let $3 \le p < 5$, and $u_0 \in H_0^1(\Omega)$. There exists a unique global in time solution u, which is in the energy class, $C(\mathbb{R}, H_0^1(\Omega))$, to the nonlinear equation* (2.2) *in the defocusing case (+ sign in* (2.2)*). Moreover, this solution scatters for large times: there exists two scattering states $u^\pm \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that*

$$\lim_{t \leftarrow \pm\infty} \|u(x,t) - e^{it\Delta_D} u^\pm\|_{H_0^1(\Omega)} = 0.$$

As mentioned in the introduction, the (global) existence part was dealt with in [16]; for the scattering part, the $p = 3$ case was also dealt with in [16]. In the setting of Theorem 2.2, one may adapt the usual argument from the $\mathbb{R}^n$ case, combining a priori estimates and a good Cauchy theory at the critical regularity; this provides a very short argument in the range $3 + 2/5 < p < 5$. In the remaining range, namely $3 < p \le 3 + 2/5$, one unfortunately needs to adapt the intricate proof from [16], and this leads to a much lenghtier proof; we provide it mostly for the sake of completeness. This type of argument may however be of relevance in other contexts.

3 Smoothing type estimates

We start with definitions and notations. Let $\psi(\xi^2) \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\})$ and $\psi_j(\xi^2) = \psi(2^{-2j}\xi^2)$. On the domain Ω, one has the spectral resolution of the Dirichlet Laplacian, and we may define smooth spectral projections $\Delta_j = \psi_j(-\Delta_D)$ as continuous operators on L^2. Moreover, these operators are continuous on L^p for all p, and if f is Hilbert-valued and such that $\| \|f\|_H \|_{L^p(\Omega)} < +\infty$, then the operators Δ_j are continuous as well on $L^p(H)$. We refer to [14] for an extensive discussion and references. We simply point out that if $H = L_t^2$, then Δ_j is continuous on all $L_x^p L_t^q$ by interpolation with the obvious $L_t^p(L_x^p)$ bound and duality.

In this section we concentrate on estimates for the linear Schrödinger equation on $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}$ with Dirichlet boundary conditions,

$$i\partial_t u_L + \Delta_D u_L = 0, \quad u_{L|\partial\Omega} = 0, \quad u_{L|t=0} = u_0 \tag{3.1}$$

Theorem 3.1. *The following local smoothing estimate holds for the homogeneous linear equation* (3.1)*,*

$$\|\Delta_j u_L\|_{L_x^5 L_t^2} \lesssim 2^{-\frac{j}{10}} \|\Delta_j u_0\|_{L_x^2}. \tag{3.2}$$

Moreover, let $2 \le q \le \infty$, then

$$\|\Delta_j u_L\|_{L_x^5 L_t^q} \lesssim 2^{-j(\frac{2}{q} - \frac{9}{10})} \|\Delta_j u_0\|_{L_x^2}. \tag{3.3}$$

Consider now the inhomogeneous equation,

$$i\partial_t v + \Delta_D v = F, \quad v_{|\partial\Omega} = 0, \quad v_{|t=0} = 0. \tag{3.4}$$

From Theorem 3.1, we will obtain the following set of estimates:

Theorem 3.2. *Let $2 \leq q < r \leq +\infty$, then*

$$\|\Delta_j v\|_{C_t(L^2_x)} + 2^{j(\frac{2}{q}-\frac{9}{10})}\|\Delta_j v\|_{L^5_x L^q_t} \lesssim 2^{-j(\frac{4}{r}-\frac{9}{5})}\|\Delta_j F\|_{L^{\frac{5}{4}}_x L^{r'}_t}, \tag{3.5}$$

with $1/r + 1/r' = 1$.

Combining the previous theorems with the results from [16], we finally state the set of estimates which will be used later for

$$i\partial_t u + \Delta_D u = F_1 + F_2, \quad u_{|\partial\Omega} = 0, \quad v_{|t=0} = u_0. \tag{3.6}$$

Theorem 3.3. *Let $2 < r \leq +\infty$, then*

$$\begin{aligned}\|\Delta_j u\|_{C_t(L^2_x)} + 2^{\frac{j}{10}}\|\Delta_j u\|_{L^5_x L^2_t} + 2^{-\frac{3}{4}j}\|\Delta_j u\|_{L^4_{t,x}} \lesssim \|\Delta_j u_0\|_{L^2_x} + 2^{-j(\frac{4}{r}-\frac{9}{5})}\|\Delta_j F_1\|_{L^{\frac{5}{4}}_x L^{r'}_t} \\ + 2^{-\frac{1}{4}j}\|\Delta_j F_2\|_{L^{\frac{4}{3}}_{t,x}},\end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

with $1/r + 1/r' = 1$.

3.1 Proof of Theorem 3.1

Let $\tilde{\psi} \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\})$ be such that $\tilde{\psi} = 1$ on the support of ψ: hence, if $\tilde{\Delta}_j$ denotes the corresponding localization operator, $\tilde{\Delta}_j \Delta_j = \Delta_j$. We now split the solution of the linear equation $\Delta_j u_L = \tilde{\Delta}_j \Delta_j u_L$ as a sum of two terms $\tilde{\Delta}_j \chi \Delta_j u_L + \tilde{\Delta}_j (1-\chi)\Delta_j u_L$, where $\chi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ is compactly supported and it is equal to 1 near the boundary $\partial\Omega$.

3.1.1 Far from the boundary: $\tilde{\Delta}_j(1-\chi)\Delta_j u_L$

Set $w_h(t,x) = (1-\chi)\Delta_j e^{it\Delta_D} u_0(x)$. Then w_h satisfies

$$\begin{cases} i\partial_t w_h + \Delta_D w_h = -[\Delta_D, \chi]\Delta_j u_L, \\ w_h|_{t=0} = (1-\chi)\Delta_j u_0. \end{cases} \tag{3.8}$$

Since χ is equal to 1 near the boundary $\partial\Omega$, we can view the solution to (3.8) as the solution of a problem in the whole space $\mathbb{R}^3$. Consequently, the Duhamel formula writes

$$w_h(t,x) = e^{it\Delta_0}(1-\chi)\Delta_j u_0 - \int_0^t e^{i(t-s)\Delta_0}[\Delta_D, \chi]\Delta_j u_L(s)ds, \tag{3.9}$$

where Δ_0 is the free Laplacian on $\mathbb{R}^3$ and therefore the contribution of $e^{it\Delta_0}(1-\chi)\Delta_j u_0$ satisfies the usual Strichartz estimates. We have thus reduced the problem to the study of the second term in the right hand-side of (3.9). Ideally, one would like to remove the time restriction $s<t$ and use a variant of the Christ-Kiselev lemma. However, this would miss the endpoint case $q=2$. Instead, we recall the following lemma:

Lemma 3.1 (Staffilani-Tataru [19]). *Let $x\in\mathbb{R}^n$, $n\geq 3$ and let $f(x,t)$ be compactly supported in space, such that $f\in L^2_t(H^{-\frac{1}{2}})$. Then the solution w to $(i\partial_t+\Delta_0)w=f$ with $w_{|t=0}=0$, is such that*

$$\|w\|_{L^2_t(L_x^{\frac{2n}{n-2}})}\lesssim\|f\|_{L^2_t(H^{-\frac{1}{2}})}. \tag{3.10}$$

In fact, one may shift regularity in (3.10) without difficulty. Now, the proof in [19] relies on a decomposition into traveling waves, to which homogeneous estimates are then applied. We can therefore use the $L^4_x(L^2_t)$ smoothing estimate, Sobolev in space, and extend the conclusion of Lemma 3.1 to

$$\|w\|_{L^5_x(L^2_t)}\lesssim\|f\|_{L^2_t(H^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{10}})}, \tag{3.11}$$

where we chose to conveniently shift the regularity to the right handside.

We now take $f=-[\Delta_D,\chi]\Delta_j u_L\in L^2_t H^{-1/2-1/10}_{\text{comp}}(\Omega)$ and

$$\|[\Delta_D,\chi]\Delta_j u_L\|_{L^2 H^{-1/2-1/10}_{\text{comp}}}\lesssim\|\Delta_j u_L\|_{L^2\dot H^{1/2-1/10}(\Omega)}\lesssim\|\Delta_j u_0\|_{\dot H^{1/10}(\Omega)},$$

from which the smoothing estimates follow

$$\begin{aligned}\|(1-\chi)\Delta_j u_L\|_{L^5(\mathbb{R}^3)L^2_t}\lesssim\|(1-\chi)\Delta_j u_0\|_{\dot H^{-\frac{1}{10}}(\mathbb{R}^3)}+\|[\Delta_D,\chi]\Delta_j u_L\|_{L^2H^{-1/2-1/10}_{\text{comp}}}&\\ \lesssim\|\Delta_j u_0\|_{\dot H^{-\frac{1}{10}}(\Omega)}.&\end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

We conclude using the continuity properties of $\tilde\Delta_j$ which were recalled at the beginning of Section 3 (e.g. see [14, Cor.2.5]). In fact, using (3.12), we get

$$\begin{aligned}\|\tilde\Delta_j(1-\chi)\Delta_j u_L\|_{L^5_xL^2_t}&\lesssim\|(1-\chi)\Delta_j u_L\|_{L^5_xL^2_t}\\ &\lesssim 2^{-\frac{j}{10}}\|\Delta_j u_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)},\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the spectral localization Δ_j to estimate

$$\|\Delta_j u_0\|_{\dot H^\sigma(\Omega)}\simeq 2^{\sigma j}\|\Delta_j u_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

3.1.2 Close to the boundary: $\tilde{\Delta}_j \chi \Delta_j u_L$

For $l \in \mathbb{Z}$ let $\varphi_l \in C_0^\infty(((l-1/2)\pi,(l+1)\pi))$ equal to 1 on $[l\pi,(l+1/2)\pi]$. We set $v_j = \tilde{\Delta}_j \chi \Delta_j u_L$ and for $l \in \mathbb{Z}$ we set $v_{j,l} = \varphi_l(2^j t) v_j$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\|v_j\|^2_{L^5(\Omega)L^2(\mathbb{R})} &= \|\sum_{l\in\mathbb{Z}} v_{j,l}\|^2_{L^5_x L^2_t} \simeq \|\|\sum_{l\in\mathbb{Z}} v_{j,l}\|^2_{L^2_t}\|_{L^{5/2}_x} \\ &\lesssim \|\sum_{l\in\mathbb{Z}} \|v_{j,l}\|^2_{L^2_t}\|_{L^{5/2}_x} \leq \sum_{l\in\mathbb{Z}} \|v_{j,l}\|^2_{L^5_x L^2_t},\end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

where for the first inequality we used the fact that the supports in time of φ_l are almost orthogonal. In order to estimate $\|v_j\|^2_{L^5_x L^2_t}$ it will be thus sufficient to estimate each $\|v_{j,l}\|^2_{L^5_x L^2_t}$. The equation satisfied by $\tilde{v}_{j,l} := \varphi_l(2^j t)\chi\Delta_j u_L$ is

$$i\partial_t \tilde{v}_{j,l} + \Delta_D \tilde{v}_{j,l} = -(\varphi_l(2^j t)[\Delta_D,\chi]\Delta_j u_L - i2^j \varphi_l'(2^j t)\chi\Delta_j u_L), \tag{3.14}$$

where we stress that $\tilde{v}_{j,l}$ vanishes outside the time interval $(2^{-j}(l-1/2)\pi, 2^{-j}(l+1)\pi)$. We denote $V_{j,l}$ the right hand side in (3.14), namely

$$V_{j,l} := -\varphi_l(2^j t)[\Delta_D,\chi]\Delta_j u_L + i2^j \varphi_l'(2^j t)\chi\Delta_j u_L. \tag{3.15}$$

Let $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ be an open cube sufficiently large such that $\partial\Omega$ is contained in the interior of Q. We denote by S the punctured torus obtained from removing the obstacle Θ (recall that $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \Theta$) in the compact manifold obtained from Q with periodic boundary conditions on ∂Q. Notice that defined in this way S coincides with the Sinaï billiard. Let also $\Delta_S := \sum_{j=1}^3 \partial_j^2$ denote the Laplace operator on the compact domain S.

On S, we may define a spectral localization operator using eigenvalues λ_k and eigenvectors e_k of Δ_S: if $f = \sum_k c_k e_k$, then

$$\Delta_j^S f = \psi(2^{-2j}\Delta_S) f = \sum_k \psi(2^{-2j}\lambda_k^2) c_k e_k. \tag{3.16}$$

Remark 3.1. *Notice that in a neighborhood of the boundary, the domains of Δ_S and Δ_D coincide, thus if $\tilde{\chi} \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ is supported near $\partial\Omega$ then*

$$\Delta_S \tilde{\chi} = \Delta_D \tilde{\chi}.$$

In order to apply estimates on the manifold S, we will need to relocalize close to the obstacle. Consider $\chi_1 \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ supported near the boundary and equal to 1 on the support of $\tilde{\chi}$, we will write

$$\chi_1 \tilde{\Delta}_j \tilde{\chi} = \chi_1 \tilde{\Delta}_j^S \tilde{\chi} + \chi_1(\tilde{\Delta}_j - \tilde{\Delta}_j^S)\tilde{\chi}, \tag{3.17}$$

with the expectation that the difference term is smoothing.

In what follows let $\tilde{\chi} \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ be equal to 1 on the support of χ and be supported in a neighborhood of $\partial\Omega$ such that on its support the operator $-\Delta_D$ coincide with $-\Delta_S$. From their respective definition, $\tilde{v}_{j,l} = \tilde{\chi}\tilde{v}_{j,l}$, $V_{j,l} = \tilde{\chi}V_{j,l}$, consequently $\tilde{v}_{j,l}$ will also solve the following equation on the compact manifold S

$$\begin{cases} i\partial_t \tilde{v}_{j,l} + \Delta_S \tilde{v}_{j,l} = V_{j,l}, \\ \tilde{v}_{j,l}|_{t<h(l-1/2)\pi} = 0, \quad \tilde{v}_{j,l}|_{t>h(l+1)\pi} = 0. \end{cases} \tag{3.18}$$

Therefore we can write the Duhamel formula either for the last equation (3.18) on S, or for the equation (3.14) on Ω. We now apply $\tilde{\Delta}_j$ and use that $v_{j.l} = \tilde{\Delta}_j \tilde{v}_{j,l}$, $\tilde{\chi}\tilde{v}_{j,l} = \tilde{v}_{j,l}$ and $\tilde{\Delta}_j\tilde{\chi} = \chi_1 \tilde{\Delta}_j^S \tilde{\chi} + (1-\chi_1)\tilde{\Delta}_j\tilde{\chi} + \chi_1(\tilde{\Delta}_j - \tilde{\Delta}_j^S)\chi$, which yields

$$\begin{aligned} v_{j,l}(t,x) = \chi_1 \int_{h(l-1/2)\pi}^t & e^{i(t-s)\Delta_S} \tilde{\Delta}_j^S V_{j,l}(s,x)ds \\ & + (1-\chi_1) \int_{h(l-1/2)\pi}^t e^{i(t-s)\Delta_D} \tilde{\Delta}_j V_{j,l}(s,x)ds \\ & + \chi_1(\tilde{\Delta}_j - \tilde{\Delta}_j^S)\tilde{v}_{j,l}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.19}$$

where we conveniently chose to write Duhamel on S for the first term and Duhamel on Ω for the second one, which allows to commute the flow under the time integral. Denote by $v_{j,l,m}$ the first term in the second line of (3.19) by $v_{j,l,f}$ the second one and $v_{j,l,s}$ the last one. We deal with them separately. To estimate the $L_x^5 L_t^2$ norm of the $v_{j,l,f}$ we notice that its support is far from the boundary: as such, estimates on the $L_x^5 L_t^2$ norm will follow from Section 3.1.1. Indeed, we get

$$\|(1-\chi_1)\tilde{\Delta}_j e^{i(t-s)\Delta_D} V_{j,l}\|_{L_x^5 L_t^2} \lesssim \|\tilde{\Delta}_j V_{j,l}\|_{\dot{H}^{-1/10}(\Omega)} \simeq 2^{-\frac{j}{10}} \|\tilde{\Delta}_j V_{j,l}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}. \tag{3.20}$$

We then apply the Minkowski inequality to deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \|(1-\chi_1) \int_{h(l-1/2)\pi}^t & \tilde{\Delta}_j e^{i(t-s)\Delta_D} V_{j,l}(s,x)ds\|_{L_x^5 L_t^2} \\ & \leq 2^{-j/2} \Big(\int_{I_{j,l}} \|(1-\chi_1)\tilde{\Delta}_j e^{i(t-s)\Delta_D} V_{j,l}(s,.)\|^2_{L^5(\Omega)L^2(I_{j,l})} ds\Big)^{1/2}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.21}$$

where we denoted $I_{j,l} = [2^{-j}(l-1/2)\pi, 2^{-j}(l+1)\pi]$ and we used the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality. Using (3.20) we finally get

$$\|v_{j,l,f}\|_{L^5(\Omega)L^2(I_{j,l})} \leq 2^{-j(1/2+1/10)} \|\tilde{\Delta}_j V_{j,l}\|_{L^2(I_{j,l})L^2(\Omega)}. \tag{3.22}$$

To estimate the $L_x^5 L_t^2$ norm of the main contribution $v_{j,l,m}$ we need the following:

Proposition 3.1. *Let $j \geq 0$, $I_j = (-\pi 2^{-j}, \pi 2^{-j})$, $\tilde{\chi} \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ be supported near $\partial\Omega$ and $V_0 \in L^2(\Omega)$. Then there exists $C > 0$ independent of j such that for the solution $e^{it\Delta_S}\tilde{\Delta}_j^S\tilde{\chi}V_0$ of the linear Schrödinger equation on S with initial data $\tilde{\Delta}_j^S\tilde{\chi}V_0$ we have*

$$\|e^{it\Delta_S}\tilde{\Delta}_j^S\tilde{\chi}V_0\|_{L^5(S)L_t^2(I_j)} \leq C2^{-\frac{j}{10}}\|\tilde{\Delta}_j^S\tilde{\chi}V_0\|_{L^2(S)}. \tag{3.23}$$

We postpone the proof of Proposition 3.1 to Subsection 3.3.

Using the fact that $v_{j,l}$ is supported in time in $I_{j,l} = [2^{-j}(l-1/2)\pi, 2^{-j}(l+1)\pi]$, the Minkowski inequality, Proposition 3.1 with $\tilde{\chi} = 1$ on the support of χ and with $V_0 = V_{j,l}$, and since $\tilde{\chi}_1 v_{j,l,m} = v_{j,l,m}$ for any $\tilde{\chi}_1 \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ with $\tilde{\chi}_1 = 1$ on the support of χ_1, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\|v_{j,l,m}\|_{L^5(\Omega)L^2(I_{j,l})} =& \|\tilde{\chi}_1 v_{j,l,m}\|_{L^5(\Omega)L^2(I_{j,l})} = \|v_{j,l,m}\|_{L^5(S)L^2(I_{j,l})} \\
\leq& \int_{2^{-j}(l-1)\pi}^{2^{-j}(l+1)\pi} \|e^{i(t-s)\Delta_S}\tilde{\Delta}_j^S V_{j,l}(s,.)\|_{L^5(S)L^2(I_{j,l})} ds \\
\leq& 2^{-\frac{j}{10}} \int_{I_{j,l}} \|\tilde{\Delta}_j^S V_{j,l}(s)\|_{L^2(S)} ds \\
\leq& 2^{-\frac{j}{10}} \int_{I_{j,l}} \|\tilde{\chi} V_{j,l}(s)\|_{L^2(S)} ds \\
\leq& 2^{-\frac{j}{10}} \int_{I_{j,l}} \|\tilde{\chi} V_{j,l}(s)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} ds
\end{aligned} \tag{3.24}$$

where we used again $V_{j,l} = \tilde{\chi}V_{j,l}$ to switch S and Ω and continuity of Δ_j^S on $L^2(S)$. Using the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality in (3.24) yields

$$\|v_{j,l,m}\|_{L^5(\Omega)L^2(I_{j,l})} \lesssim 2^{-j(1/2+1/10)}\|V_{j,l}\|_{L^2(I_{j,l})L^2(\Omega)} \tag{3.25}$$

We deal with the right handside in (3.25). Using the explicit expression of $V_{j,l}$ given in (3.15),

$$\begin{aligned}
\|V_{j,l}(s)\|_{L^2(I_{j,l})L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim & (\|\varphi_l(2^j t)[\Delta_D, \chi]\Delta_j u_L\|_{L^2(I_{j,l})L^2(\Omega)} \\
& + 2^j\|\varphi_l'(2^j t)\chi\Delta_j u_L\|_{L^2(I_{j,l})L^2(\Omega)}).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.26}$$

As $[\Delta_D, \chi]$ is bounded from H_0^1 to L^2, we get

$$\|\tilde{\Delta}_j V_{j,l}\|_{L^2(I_{j,l})L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim \|\chi_1\Delta_j u_L\|_{L^2(I_{j,l})H_0^1(\Omega)} + 2^j\|\chi\Delta_j u_L\|_{L^2(I_{j,l})L^2(\Omega)} \tag{3.27}$$

Let us recall the following local smoothing result on a non trapping domain:

Lemma 3.2. *(Burq, Gérard, Tzvetkov [2, Prop.2.7]) Assume that $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^3 \backslash \Theta$, where $\Theta \neq \emptyset$ is a non-trapping obstacle. Then, for every $\tilde{\chi} \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$, and $\sigma \in [-1/2, 1]$,*

$$\|\tilde{\chi}\Delta_j u_L\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}, \dot{H}^{\sigma+1/2}(\Omega))} \leq C\|\Delta_j u_0\|_{H^\sigma(\Omega)}, \tag{3.28}$$

where, as usual, $u_L(t,x) = e^{-it\Delta_D}u_0(x)$.

We now turn to the difference term $v_{j,l,s}$ and prove a smoothing lemma.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $\chi_1 \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be equal to 1 on a fixed neighborhood of the support of $\tilde{\chi}$. Then we have for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\|v_{j,l,s}\|_{L^5(\Omega)L^2(I_{j,l})} \leq C_N 2^{-Nj} \|V_{j,l}(x,s)\|_{L^2(I_{j,l},L^2(\Omega))}. \tag{3.29}$$

In order to prove the lemma, one would like to rewrite $\tilde{\Delta}_j = \tilde{\psi}(2^{-2j}\Delta_D)$ as a solution of the wave equation, using $h = 2^{-j}$ as a time. Then the finite speed of propagation would let us switch Δ_D and Δ_S. However the inverse Fourier transform (in $|\xi|$) of $\Psi(|\xi|) = \tilde{\psi}(|\xi|^2)$ is only Schwartz class, rather than compactly supported. The tails will eventually account for the right handside of (3.29). We now turn to the details: let $\varphi_0, \varphi(y)$ be even, compactly supported ($\varphi(y)$ away from zero) and such that

$$\varphi_0(y) + \sum_{k\geq 1} \varphi(2^{-k}y) = 1.$$

We decompose $\hat{\Psi}(y)$ using this resolution of the identity, and set with obvious notations

$$\Psi(|\xi|) = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \phi_k(|\xi|),$$

where the ϕ_k have good bounds, say $\hat{\phi}_0 \in L^\infty$ and for $k \geq 1$

$$\forall N \in \mathbb{N}, \;\; \|\hat{\phi}_k\|_\infty = \|\hat{\Psi}(y)\varphi(2^{-k}y)\|_\infty \leq C_N 2^{-kN}. \tag{3.30}$$

At fixed k, we write (abusing notation and letting Δ be either Δ_D or Δ_S)

$$\phi_k(h\sqrt{-\Delta})\tilde{\chi}\tilde{v}_{j,l} = \frac{1}{2\pi}\int e^{iyh\sqrt{-\Delta}}\tilde{\chi}(x)\tilde{v}_{j,l}(x)\hat{\phi}_k(y)\,dy.$$

Notice that $\phi_k(y)$ is compactly supported, in fact its support is roughly $|y| \in [2^{k-1}, 2^{k+1}]$. As such the y integral is a time average of half-wave operators, which have finite speed of propagation. Therefore if the time $|yh| \leq 1$, we can add another cut-off function χ_1 which is equal to one on the domain of dependency of $\tilde{\chi}$ on this time scale, and such that χ_1 is indifferently defined on S or Ω: namely, for $k \lesssim j$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi_k(h\sqrt{-\Delta_S})\tilde{\chi}\tilde{v}_{j,l} &= \chi_1(x)\phi_k(h\sqrt{-\Delta_S})\tilde{\chi}\tilde{v}_{j,l} \\
&= \chi_1(x)\frac{1}{2\pi}\int e^{iyh\sqrt{-\Delta}}\tilde{\chi}(x)\tilde{v}_{j,l}(x)\hat{\phi}_k(y)\,dy, \\
\phi_k(2^{-j}\sqrt{-\Delta_S})\tilde{\chi}\tilde{v}_{j,l} &= \chi_1(x)\phi_k(2^{-j}\sqrt{-\Delta_D})\tilde{\chi}\tilde{v}_{j,l}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.31}$$

From this identity, we obtain

$$v_{j,l,s} = \chi_1(x) \sum_{j \lesssim k} (\phi_k(2^{-j}\sqrt{-\Delta_D}) - \phi_k(2^{-j}\sqrt{-\Delta_S}))\tilde{\chi}(x)\tilde{v}_{j,l}. \tag{3.32}$$

At this point the difference in (3.32) is irrelevant and we estimate both terms using Sobolev embedding and energy estimates. Abusing notations, with $\Delta \in \{\Delta_D, \Delta_S\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\chi_1\phi_k(2^{-j}\sqrt{-\Delta})\tilde{\chi}\tilde{v}_{j,l}\|_{L^5(\Omega)L^2_t(I_{j,l})} \leq & \|\chi_1\phi_k(2^{-j}\sqrt{-\Delta})\tilde{\chi}\tilde{v}_{j,l}\|_{L^2_t(I_{j,l})L^5(\Omega)} \\
\leq & 2^{-\frac{j}{2}}\|\chi_1\phi_k(2^{-j}\sqrt{-\Delta})\tilde{\chi}\tilde{v}_{j,l}\|_{L^\infty_t(I_{j,l})L^5(\Omega)} \\
\lesssim & 2^{-\frac{j}{2}}\|\phi_k(2^{-j}\sqrt{-\Delta})\tilde{\chi}\tilde{v}_{j,l}\|_{L^\infty_t(I_{j,l})H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Omega)} \\
\lesssim & C_N 2^{-\frac{j}{2}-kN}\|\tilde{\chi}\tilde{v}_{j,l}\|_{L^\infty_t(I_{j,l})H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Omega)}
\end{aligned}$$

where we used Minkowski, Hölder, (non sharp !) Sobolev and (3.30). Finally, by the dual estimate of (3.28),

$$\|\tilde{v}_{j,l}\|_{L^\infty_t(I_{j,l})H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Omega)} \lesssim \|V_{j,l}\|_{L^2_t(I_{j,l},L^2(\Omega))}.$$

Summing in k and relabeling N, we have

$$\|v_{j,l,s}\|_{L^5(\Omega)L^2_t(I_{j,l})} \leq C_N 2^{-jN}\|V_{j,l}\|_{L^2_t(I_{j,l},L^2(\Omega))}, \tag{3.33}$$

which concludes the proof of the lemma.

Using this lemma and (3.27), we get for $v_{j,l,s}$ an estimate which matches (3.25): picking $N = 1$ is enough. From there, using (3.13), (3.22), (3.25), we write

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\tilde{\Delta}_j\chi\Delta_j u_L\|^2_{L^5(\Omega)L^2_t} \lesssim & 2^{-2j(\frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{10})}\sum_{l\in\mathbb{Z}}\|\tilde{\Delta}_j V_{j,l}(s)\|^2_{L^2(I_{j,l})L^2(\Omega)} \\
\lesssim & 2^{-2j(\frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{10})}\sum_{l\in\mathbb{Z}}(\|\tilde{\chi}\Delta_j u_L\|^2_{L^2(I_{j,l})H^1_0(\Omega)} + 2^{2j}\|\tilde{\chi}\Delta_j u_L\|^2_{L^2(I_{j,l})L^2(\Omega)}) \\
\lesssim & 2^{-\frac{2j}{10}}(2^{-j}\|\tilde{\Delta}_j u_0\|^2_{\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Omega)} + 2^j\|\tilde{\Delta}_j u_0\|^2_{\dot{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\Omega)}) \\
\lesssim & 2^{-\frac{2j}{10}}(\|\tilde{\Delta}_j u_0\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)},
\end{aligned}$$

which is the desired result.

3.1.3 End of the proof of Theorem 3.1

Until now we have prove Theorem 3.1 only for $q = 2$. We shall use the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality in order to deduce (3.3) for every $q \geq 2$. We have

$$\|\Delta_j u_L\|_{L^\infty_t} \lesssim \|\Delta_j u_L\|^{1/2}_{L^2_t}\|\Delta_j\partial_t u_L\|^{1/2}_{L^2_t}.$$

which gives, taking the L^5_x norms and using the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality

$$\|\Delta_j u_L\|^5_{L^5_x L^\infty_t} \lesssim \|\Delta_j u_L\|^{5/2}_{L^5 L^2_t} \|\Delta_j \partial_t u_L\|^{5/2}_{L^5_x L^2_t}. \tag{3.34}$$

It remains to estimate $\|\Delta_j \partial_t u_L\|_{L^5_x L^2_t}$: notice that since $u_L = e^{-it\Delta_D} u_0$

$$\Delta_j \partial_t u_L = -i\Delta_D \Delta_j u_L = i2^{2j} \tilde{\Delta}_j u_L,$$

where $\tilde{\Delta}_j$ is defined with $\psi_1(x) = x\psi(x) \in C^\infty_0(\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\})$. Therefore

$$\|\Delta_j \partial_t u_L\|_{L^5_x L^\infty_t} \leq C 2^{j(2-1/10)} \|\tilde{\Delta}_j u_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \tag{3.35}$$

consequently

$$\|\Delta_j \partial_t u_L\|_{L^5_x L^q_t} \leq C 2^{-j(2/q-9/10)} \|\Delta_j u_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$$

and Theorem 3.1 is proved.

3.2 Proof of Theorems 3.2 and 3.3

We recall a lemma due to Christ and Kiselev [8]. We state the corollary we will use, with only the time variable: we refer to [5] for a simple direct proof of all the different cases we use, with Banach-valued $L^p_t(B)$ spaces or $B(L^p_t)$. Its use in the context of reversed norms $L^q_x(L^p_t)$ goes back to [15] and it greatly simplifies obtaining inhomogeneous estimates from homogeneous ones.

Lemma 3.4. *(Christ and Kiselev [8]) Consider a bounded operator*

$$T : L^r(\mathbb{R}) \to L^q(\mathbb{R})$$

given by a locally integrable kernel $K(t, s)$. Suppose that $r < q$. Then the restricted operator

$$T_R f(t) = \int_{s<t} K(t, s) f(s) ds$$

is bounded from $L^r(\mathbb{R})$ to $L^q(\mathbb{R})$ and

$$\|T_R\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}) \to L^q(\mathbb{R})} \leq C(1 - 2^{-(1/q-1/r)})^{-1} \|T\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}) \to L^q(\mathbb{R})}.$$

From the lemma, the proof of the inhomogeneous set of estimates in Theorem 3.2 is routine from the homogeneous estimates in Theorem 3.1 and the Duhamel formula. Combining both homogeneous and inhomogeneous estimates yields Theorem 3.3.

3.3 Proof of Proposition 3.1

Let S denote the compact domain defined above. Recall $(e_n)_n$ is the eigenbasis of $L^2(S)$ consisting of eigenfunctions of $-\Delta_S$ associated to the eigenvalues λ_n^2. Following [4], we define an abstract self adjoint operator on $L^2(S)$ as follows

$$A_h(e_n) := -[h\lambda_n^2]e_n,$$

where $[\lambda]$ is the integer part of λ. Notice that in some sense $A_h = "[h\Delta_S]"$. We first need to establish estimates for the linear Schrödinger equation on the compact domain S with spectrally localized initial data.

We now set $h = 2^{-j}$ and state estimates on the evolution equation where $h\Delta_S$ is replaced by A_h.

Lemma 3.5. *Let $0 < h \leq 1$, $q \geq 2$, $I_h = (-\pi h, \pi h)$, $\tilde{\chi} \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ be supported near $\partial\Omega$ and $V_0 \in L^2(\Omega)$. There exists $C > 0$ independent of h such that*

$$\|e^{i\frac{t}{h}A_h}\tilde{\Delta}_j^S\tilde{\chi}V_0\|_{L^5(S)L^q(I_h)} \leq Ch^{2/q-9/10}\|\tilde{\Delta}_j^S\tilde{\chi}V_0\|_{L^2(S)}. \tag{3.36}$$

We postpone the proof of Lemma 3.5 and proceed with the proof of Proposition 3.1. Denote by $V_h(t,x) := e^{it\Delta_S}\tilde{\Delta}_j^S\tilde{\chi}V_0(x)$, then

$$(ih\partial_t + A_h)V_h = (ih\partial_t + h\Delta_S)V_h + (A_h - h\Delta_S)V_h = (A_h - h\Delta_S)e^{it\Delta_S}\tilde{\Delta}_j^S\tilde{\chi}V_0.$$

Writing Duhamel formula for V_h yields

$$V_h(t,x) = e^{i\frac{t}{h}A_h}\tilde{\Delta}_j^S\tilde{\chi}V_0(x) - \frac{i}{h}\int_0^t e^{i\frac{(t-s)}{h}A_h}(A_h - h\Delta_S)e^{is\Delta_S}\tilde{\Delta}_j^S\tilde{\chi}V_0(x)ds. \tag{3.37}$$

Using (3.36) with $q = 2$, (3.37), the Minkowski inequality and boundedness of the operator

$$\|e^{i\frac{t}{h}A_h}\tilde{\Delta}_j^S\|_{L^2(S)\to L^5(S)L^2(I_h)} \lesssim 2^{-\frac{j}{10}} \sim h^{1/10}$$

(which follows from the proof of Lemma 3.5), we obtain

$$\|e^{it\Delta_S}\tilde{\Delta}_j^S\tilde{\chi}V_0\|_{L^5(S)L^2(I_h)} \lesssim h^{\frac{1}{10}}\Big(\|\tilde{\Delta}_j^S\tilde{\chi}V_0\|_{L^2(S)} + \frac{1}{h}\|(A_h - h\Delta_S)e^{is\Delta_S}\tilde{\Delta}_j^S\tilde{\chi}V_0\|_{L^1(-h\pi,h\pi)L^2(S)}\Big), \tag{3.38}$$

where to estimate the second term in the right hand side of (3.37) we used the fact that A_h commutes with the spectral localization $\tilde{\Delta}_j^S$. Changing variables $s = h\tau$ in the second term in the right hand side of (3.38) yields

$$\frac{1}{h}\|(A_h - h\Delta_S)e^{is\Delta_S}\tilde{\Delta}_j^S\tilde{\chi}V_0\|_{L^1(-h\pi,h\pi)L^2(S)} = \int_{-\pi}^{\pi}\|(A_h - h\Delta_S)e^{i\tau h\Delta_S}\tilde{\Delta}_j^S\tilde{\chi}V_0\|_{L^2(S)}d\tau \lesssim 2\pi\|\tilde{\Delta}_j^S\tilde{\chi}V_0\|_{L^2(S)}, \tag{3.39}$$

where we used the fact that the operator $(A_h - h\Delta_S)$ is bounded on $L^2(S)$ and the mass conservation of the linear Schrödinger flow. If follows from (3.38) and (3.39) that

$$\|e^{it\Delta_S}\tilde{\Delta}_j^S\tilde{\chi}V_0\|_{L^5(S)L^2(I_h)} \lesssim h^{1/10}\|\tilde{\Delta}_j^S\tilde{\chi}V_0\|_{L^2(S)},$$

which ends the proof of Proposition 3.1.

We now return to Lemma 3.5 for the rest of this section. Writing $\tilde{\Delta}_j^S V_0 = \sum_n \tilde{\psi}(h^2\lambda_n^2)V_{\lambda_n}e_n$, we decompose (for $0 < h \leq 1/4$)

$$e^{i\frac{t}{h}A_h}\tilde{\Delta}_j^S V_0(t,x) = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} e^{i\frac{t}{h}k}v_k(x)$$

with

$$v_k(x) = \sum_{\lambda=(k2^j)^{1/2}}^{((k+1)2^j)^{1/2}-1}\ \sum_{\lambda_n\in[\lambda,\lambda+1)} \tilde{\Psi}(h^2\lambda_n^2)V_{\lambda_n}e_n = \sum_{\lambda=(k2^j)^{1/2}}^{((k+1)2^j)^{1/2}-1} \Pi_\lambda(\tilde{\Delta}_j^S V_0),$$

where Π_λ denotes the spectral projector $\Pi_\lambda = 1_{\sqrt{-\Delta_S}\in[\lambda,\lambda+1)}$. Let us estimate the $L^5(S)L^q(I_h)$ norm of $e^{i\frac{t}{h}A_h}\tilde{\Delta}_j^S V_0$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|e^{i\frac{t}{h}A_h}\tilde{\Delta}_j^S V_0\|^2_{L^5(S)L^q(I_h)} &\lesssim h^{2/q}\|\|e^{isA_h}\tilde{\Delta}_j^S V_0\|^2_{L^q_s(-\pi,\pi)}\|_{L^{5/2}(S)} \\
&\lesssim h^{2/q}\|\|e^{isA_h}\tilde{\Delta}_j^S V_0\|^2_{H^{1/2-1/q}(s\in(-\pi,\pi))}\|_{L^{5/2}(S)} \\
&\lesssim h^{2/q}\|\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}}(1+k)^{2(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{q})}\|e^{isk}v_k(x)\|^2_{L^2_s(-\pi,\pi)}\|_{L^{5/2}(S)} \\
&\lesssim h^{2/q}\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}}(1+k)^{1-2/q}\|e^{isk}v_k(x)\|^2_{L^5(S)L^2(-\pi,\pi)} \\
&\lesssim h^{2/q}\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}}(1+k)^{1-2/q}\|e^{isk}v_k(x)\|^2_{L^2(-\pi,\pi)L^5(S)},
\end{aligned}$$

where we used Sobolev injection in the time variable $H^{1/2-1/q}\subset L^q$ and Plancherel in time. We recall a result of [18] of Smith and Sogge on the spectral projector Π_λ:

Theorem 3.4. *(Smith and Sogge [18]) Let S be a compact manifold of dimension 3, then*

$$\|\Pi_\lambda\|_{L^2(S)\to L^5(S)} \leq \lambda^{2/5}.$$

Using Theorem 3.4 we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|e^{i\frac{t}{h}A_h}\tilde{\Delta}_j^S V_0\|^2_{L^5(S)L^q(I_h)} &\lesssim h^{2/q}\sum_{1/4h-1\leq k\leq 4/h}(1+k)^{1-2/q+4/5}\|\tilde{\Delta}_j^S V_0\|^2_{L^2(S)} \\
&\lesssim \sum_{hk\in[1/4,4]} k^{1-4/q+4/5}\|\tilde{\Delta}_j^S V_0\|^2_{L^2(S)} \\
&\lesssim \|\tilde{\Delta}_j^S V_0\|^2_{\dot{H}^{2/q-9/10}(S)},
\end{aligned}$$

since for $hk > 4$ or $h(k+1) < 1/4$ and $\lambda_n \in [(k2^j)^{1/2}, ((k+1)2^j)^{1/2})$ we have $\tilde{\Psi}(h^2\lambda_n^2) = 0$ and on the other hand for these values of k we have

$$k/\sqrt{2} \le (k2^j)^{1/2} \le \lambda_n \le ((k+1)2^j)^{1/2} \le \sqrt{2}(k+1), \quad h \le 5(k+1)^{-1}.$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 3.5.

4 Local existence

In this section we prove Theorem 2.1.

Definition 4.1. *Let $u \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}\times\Omega)$ and let $\Delta_j = \psi(-2^{-2j}\Delta_D)$ be a spectral localization with respect to the Dirichlet Laplacian Δ_D in the x variable, such that $\sum_j \Delta_j = Id$ and let $S_j = \sum_{k<j}\Delta_j$. We introduce the "Banach valued" Besov space $\dot{B}^{s,q}_p(L^r_t)$ as follows: we say that $u \in \dot{B}^{s,q}_p(L^r_t)$ if*

$$\left(2^{js}\|\Delta_j u\|_{L^p_x L^r_t}\right) \in l^q,$$

and $\sum_j \Delta_j f$ converges to f in $\mathcal{S}'$. If L^r_t is replaced by L^r_T, the time integration is meant to be over $(-T,T)$. Moreover, when $s<0$, Δ_j may be replaced by S_j in the norm and both norms are equivalent.

Consider $u_0 \in \dot{H}^1_0$ and u_L the solution to the linear equation (3.1). Applying Theorem 3.1 with $q = 2, 5$ and taking $s = 1$ in the definition above we obtain

$$u_L \in \dot{B}_5^{1+\frac{1}{10},2}(L^2_t) \cap \dot{B}_5^{\frac{1}{2},2}(L^5_t) \ \text{ and } \ \partial_t u_L \in \dot{B}_5^{-\frac{3}{2},2}(L^5_t).$$

From this, by Gagliardo-Nirenberg in the time variable, one should have

$$u_L \in \dot{B}_5^{1,2}(L_t^{\frac{20}{9}}) \cap \dot{B}_5^{3/20,2}(L^{40}_t) \subset L_x^{20/3}L_t^{40},$$

and consequently

$$u_L^4 \in L_x^{5/3}L_t^{10} \text{ as well as } |u_L|^4 u_L \in \dot{B}^{1,2}_{\frac{5}{4}}(L_t^{\frac{20}{11}})$$

which should be enough to iterate. However, our spaces are Banach valued Besov spaces (if one sees time as a parametrer) and justifying Berstein-like inequalities and Sobolev embedding is not entirely trivial (but doable, using the estimates from [14]). We choose an apparently complicated space in order to set up the fixed point, but the little gain in regularity from the smoothing estimate will turn out to be crucial for subcritical scattering.

Remark 4.1. *By this choice, we only restrict the uniqueness class. It is likely that one may prove a better result, but there is no immediate benefit in the present setting, except proving* *additional estimates. We retained, however, the uniqueness class that would be provided by the argument above in the Theorems'statements. Another remark is that one may dispense with the use of Lemma 3.1, miss the endpoint $q = 2$ and still get the exact same nonlinear results, as there is room (due to the use of Sobolev embedding) in all mapping estimates. Moreover, as soon as we use an estimate with a (however small) gain in regularity, we do not need Lemma 4.11, as we could use a simpler embedding in a Besov space of negative regularity and play regularities against each other. In fact, in the same spirit as [15] one could replace the critical Sobolev norm by a Besov norm $\dot{B}_2^{s_p,\infty}$.*

For $T > 0$ let

$$X_T := \{u \,|\, u \in \dot{B}_5^{1+\frac{1}{10},2}(L_T^2) \cap \dot{B}_5^{\frac{1}{2},2}(L_T^5) \text{ and } \partial_t u \in \dot{B}_5^{-\frac{3}{2},2}(L_T^5)\}. \tag{4.1}$$

and for $u \in X_T$ set $F(u) := |u|^4 u$.

Proposition 4.1. *Define a nonlinear map ϕ as follows,*

$$\phi(u)(t) := \int_{s<t} e^{i(t-s)\Delta_D} F(u(s))ds.$$

Then

$$\|\phi(u)\|_{C_T(\dot{H}_0^1)} + \|\phi(u)\|_{X_T} \lesssim \|F(u)\|_{\dot{B}^{1,2}_{5/4}(L_T^{20/11})} \lesssim \|u\|_{X_T}^5, \tag{4.2}$$

and

$$\|\phi(u) - \phi(v)\|_{X_T} \lesssim \|F(u) - F(v)\|_{\dot{B}^{1,2}_{5/4}(L_T^{20/11})} \lesssim \|u - v\|_{X_T}(\|u\|_{X_T} + \|v\|_{X_T})^4. \tag{4.3}$$

The estimate for the inhomogeneous problem writes

$$\|\int e^{-is\Delta_D} F\|_{L_x^2} \leq C\|F\|_{\dot{B}^{0,2}_{5/4}(L_t^{20/11})},$$

Shifting the regularity to $s = 1$ and using the Christ-Kiselev lemma provides the first step of both estimates 4.2 and 4.3. Now, Lemma 4.10 in the Appendix provides the nonlinear part of both estimates (note however that, as $p = 5$ is an integer, one could prove directly the nonlinear mappings by product rules).

One may now set up the usual fixed point argument in X_T if T is sufficiently small of if the data is small. This concludes the proof of Theorem 2.1 (scattering for small data follows the usual way from the global in time space-time estimates).

We now consider local wellposedness for $p < 5$, e.g. Theorem 2.2. The critical Sobolev exponent w.r.t. scaling is $s_p = 3/2 - 2/(p-1)$. We aim at setting up a contraction argument in a small ball of

$$X_T := \{u \,|\, u \in \dot{B}_5^{s_p+\frac{1}{10},2}(L_T^2) \cap \dot{B}_4^{s_p-\frac{1}{4},2}(L_T^4) \text{ and } \partial_t u \in \dot{B}_4^{s_p-\frac{1}{4}-2,2}(L_T^4)\}. \tag{4.4}$$

The important fact (if we were to ignore issues with Banach valued Besov spaces) would be that $X_T \subset \dot{B}^{s_p,2}_5(L^{20/9}_T) \cap L^{5(p-1)/3}_x L^{10(p-1)}_T$.

Remark 4.2. *Some numerology is in order: if one were only to have the $L^5_x L^2_t$ smoothing estimate and use Sobolev (in time and in space), it would require $5(p-1)/3 \geq 5$, namely $p \geq 4$. However, we have the Strichartz estimate from [16], which allows $5(p-1)/3 \geq 4$, or $p \geq 3 + 2/5$.*

Again from the Appendix, the nonlinear mapping verifies

$$\|F(u) - F(v)\|_{\dot{B}^{s_p,2}_{5/4}(L^{20/11}_T)} \lesssim \|u - v\|_{X_T}(\|u\|^{p-1}_{X_T} + \|v\|^{p-1}_{X_T})$$

and existence and uniqueness follow by fixed point again.

4.1 Scattering for $3 + 2/5 < p < 5$

We now deal with scattering in the same range of $p \in (3 + 2/5, 5)$: from [16], we have an a priori bound

$$\|S_j u\|^4_{L^4_t L^4_x} \lesssim \|u\|^4_{L^4_t L^4_x} \lesssim \|u_0\|^3_{L^2_x} \sup_t \|u\|_{H^1_0} \leq M^{\frac{3}{2}} E^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

where M and E are the conserved charge and hamiltonian,

$$M = \int_\Omega |u|^2\, dx \text{ and } E = \int_\Omega |\nabla u|^2 + \frac{2}{p+1}|u|^{p+1}\, dx. \tag{4.5}$$

Notice how this estimate is below the critical scaling s_p, as the RHS regularity is $s = 1/4$. From the energy a priori bound and Sobolev embedding, one has on the other hand

$$\|S_j u\|_{L^\infty_{t,x}} \lesssim 2^{\frac{j}{2}} \sup_t \|u\|_{H^1_0} \lesssim 2^{\frac{j}{2}} E^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Interpolating between the two bounds to get the right scaling yields,

$$\|S_j u\|_{L^q_{t,x}} \lesssim C(M, E) 2^{j(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{5-p}{3(p-1)})}, \tag{4.6}$$

where $1/q = (5-p)/6(p-1)$. In order to proceed with the usual scattering argument, we need to revisit the fixed point, or more precisely the nonlinear estimate on $F(u)$: indeed, if we wish to use (4.6), even at a power ε, we cannot afford to use the same regularity on both sides of the Duhamel formula. Fortunately, we have off diagonal inhomogeneous estimates, e.g.

$$\| \int e^{i(t-s)\Delta_D} F\|_{\dot{B}^{s_p,2}_5(L^{20/9}_t) \cap \dot{B}^{s_p-3/4,2}_4(L^4_t)} \leq C\|F(u)\|_{\dot{B}^{s_p-\frac{1}{10},2}_{5/4}(L^2_t)}.$$

In order to evaluate $F(u)$, one needs to place the $S_j u$ factors in such a way that

$$\|(S_j u)^{p-1}\|_{L_x^{5/3} L_t^{20}} \lesssim 2^{\frac{j}{10}}.$$

However, we have from (4.6)

$$\|(\Delta_j u)^{p-1}\|_{L_{t,x}^{\frac{6}{5-p}}} \lesssim C(M,E) 2^{j(\frac{5p-13}{6})}, \tag{4.7}$$

and $6/(5-p) > 5/3$. As such, one may interpolate with

$$\|\Delta_j u\|_{L_x^4 L_t^4} \lesssim 2^{-j(s_p - \frac{1}{4})},$$

to get (after Sobolev embedding)

$$\|(\Delta_j u)^{p-1}\|_{L_x^{\frac{5}{3}} L_t^{20}} \lesssim 2^{\frac{j}{10}}.$$

Suming over low frequencies recovers the desired bound. Notice that scaling dictates the exponents (hence there is no need to compute explicitely the interpolation θ).

4.2 Scattering for $3 \leq p \leq 3 + 2/5$

In this part we consider the remaining case, e.g. nonlinearities which are close to 3 and for which our main results do not provide a scale-invariant local Cauchy theory. As mentioned before, this case will be dealt with using the approach from [16]. As such, this entire Subsection is somewhat disconnected from the rest of the paper; the combination of several technical difficulties makes it lenghty and cumbersome, but we hope the underlying strategy is clear. We have two a priori bounds on the nonlinear equation at our disposal: local smoothing, which is at the scale of $\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}$ regularity for the data, and an $L^4_{t,x}$ space-time bound, which is at the scale of $\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{4}}$ regularity for the data. Both are below the scale of critical H^s regularity, which is $s_p = \frac{3}{2} - \frac{2}{(p-1)}$. Interpolation with the energy bound provides bounds at the critical level, but the lack of flexible scale-invariant estimates on the inhomogeneous problem make them seemingly useless. As such, one has to improve both the local smoothing bound and the $L^4_{t,x}$ space-time bounds obtained in [16], to reach critical scaling and beyond. This is accomplished through several steps, which we informally summarize as follows:

- improve the space-time bounds by using the equations far and close to the boundary. As the resulting commutator source term can only be handle at $H^{\frac{1}{2}}$ regularity, this will improve estimates from $\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{4}}$ regularity to $\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon}$ regularity, which is still below scale invariance;

- combine this improved estimates with the energy bound to obtain yet again better space-time bounds through the equation (but splitting the source terms in close and far away terms). As an added bonus we also improve our local smoothing estimate; moreover we now go beyond scale-invariance;

- turn the crank a few more times, going back and forth between estimates on the split equations and estimates on the equation with split source terms, until we reach the correct set of estimates to prove scattering at the H^1_0 regularity. It is worth noticing that the numerology gets worse with $p > 3+2/5$, and that the forthcoming argument would probably break down before even reaching $p = 4$.

We start by stating a few linear estimates which will be needed in the proof and are simple consequences of our Theorem 3.3 by summing over dyadic frequencies.

Lemma 4.1. *(see [16, Lemma 5.4]) Let Ω be a non trapping domain and denote $u_L = e^{it\Delta_D}$ the linear flow for the Schrödinger equation on Ω with Dirichlet boundary conditions. Then*

$$\|e^{it\Delta_D}u_0\|_{L^4_t\dot W^{s,4}(\Omega)} \lesssim \|u_0\|_{\dot H_0^{s+\frac14}(\Omega)}. \tag{4.8}$$

Denote by w the solution of the inhomogeneous equation, e.g. $w = \int_0^t e^{i(t-s)\Delta_D} f(s)ds$, then

$$\|w\|_{C_t\dot H_0^{s+\frac14}(\Omega)} + \|w\|_{L^4_t\dot W^{s,4}} \lesssim \|f\|_{L_t^{\frac43}\dot W^{s+\frac12,\frac43}}. \tag{4.9}$$

The next lemma is just the Christ-Kiselev lemma again, stated in a form which is convenient for later use.

Lemma 4.2. *(see [16, Lemma 5.6]) Let $U(t)$ be a one parameter group of operators, $1 \le r < q \le \infty$, H an Hilbert space and B_r and B_q two Banach spaces. Suppose that*

$$\|U(t)\varphi\|_{L^q_t(B_q)} \lesssim \|\varphi\|_H \quad \textit{and} \quad \|\int_s U(-s)g(s)ds\|_H \lesssim \|g\|_{L^r_t(B_r)},$$

then

$$\|\int_{s<t} U(t-s)g(s)ds\|_{L^q_t(B_q)} \lesssim \|g\|_{L^r_t(B_r)}.$$

finally, we recall that we have Lemma 3.1 at our disposal, should we need the end-point Strichartz on the left handside in Lemma 4.2, provided that we used a (dual) local smoothing norm on the right handside.

In what follows we shall write $p = 3+2\eta$, with $\eta \in [0, 1/5]$. All the nonlinear mappings which we use can be proved using the appendix and we will no longer refer to it. We recall all a priori bounds at our disposal: the first two are uniform in time bounds for the $L^2(\Omega)$

and $H_0^1(\Omega)$ norms of the solution to the defocusing NLS, irrespective of the power p, and were already stated in the previous section, see 4.5. The next two were obtained in [16], again in the defocusing case and irrespective of p: a space-time norm estimate

$$\|u\|_{L_t^4(L^4(\Omega))} \leq E^{\frac{1}{8}} M^{\frac{3}{8}}, \tag{4.10}$$

which has the same scaling as $\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{4}}$ for the data; and a local smoothing norm estimate

$$\|\nabla u\|_{L_t^2(L^2(K))} \leq C(K) E^{\frac{1}{4}} M^{\frac{1}{4}}, \tag{4.11}$$

which has the same scaling as $\dot{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}$ for the data; here K is meant to be a compact set which includes the obstacle, and (4.11) holds only under the star-shaped condition on the obstacle, while proving (4.10) makes an essential use of (4.11).

We start with proving

Proposition 4.2. *Let u be a solution to the nonlinear problem* (2.2)*. Let $\chi \in C_0^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ be a smooth function equal to* 1 *near $\partial\Omega$. Then*

$$\chi u \in L_t^4 \dot{B}_4^{1/4-\eta,2}(\Omega) \quad \textit{and} \quad (1-\chi)u \in L_t^2 \dot{B}_6^{1/2-\eta,2}(\Omega). \tag{4.12}$$

Remark 4.3. *Notice that our cut χ is only C^2 rather thant C^∞, and this will remain so for the rest of the section. This is in no way a difficulty, and it allows to conveniently take $\chi = \chi_1^p$ or $\chi = \chi_1^{p-1}$, where $\chi_1 \in C_0^2$ as an admissible cut if we need, as $p-1 > 2$. This is particulary convenient for nonlinear mappings where all factors can be considered equal. Alternatively, one may retain C_0^∞ cuts and play with at least 3 overlapping ones, as was done in [16], at the expense of desymetrizing various nonlinear estimates. These are (mildly ennoying) considerations that the reader should ignore at first read.*

Proof. In order to prove the Proposition, we split the equation (2.2), treating differently the neighborhood of the boundary (using local smoothing type arguments) and spatial infinity (where the full range of sharp Stricharz estimates holds).

Consider the equation satisfied by χu,

$$(i\partial_t + \Delta_D)(\chi u) = \chi |u|^{2+2\eta} u - [\chi, \Delta_D] u. \tag{4.13}$$

We need to show that the nonlinear term belongs to $L_t^2 H_{comp}^{-\eta}(\Omega)$. The commutator term is controlled by $\|\tilde{\chi} u\|_{L_t^2 H_{comp}^1}$ for some $\tilde{\chi} \in C_0^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ equal to 1 on the support of χ and it belongs to $L_t^2 L_{comp}^2(\Omega) \subset L_t^2 H_{comp}^{-\eta}(\Omega)$. We now deal with the nonlinear term: let q be such that $\dot{B}_q^{1,2}(\Omega) \subset H^{-\eta}(\Omega)$, hence $1 - \frac{3}{q} = -\eta - \frac{3}{2}$. Then $\frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{2(1+\eta)}{6}$ and

$$\|\chi |u|^{2(1+\eta)} u\|_{L_t^2 H_{comp0}^{-\eta}(\Omega)} \lesssim \|\chi |u|^{2(1+\eta)} u\|_{L_t^2 \dot{B}_q^{1,2}(\Omega)} \lesssim \|\chi_1 u\|_{L_t^2 H_0^1(\Omega)} \|(\chi_1 u)^{1+\eta}\|_{L_t^\infty L^{\frac{6}{1+\eta}}(\Omega)},$$

where $\chi_1^p = \chi$ and we used $u \in L_t^\infty H_0^1(\Omega) \subset L_t^\infty L^6(\Omega)$ on two factors and $u \in L_t^2 H^1_{comp}(\Omega)$ on one factor. Hence the right hand side in (4.13) is in $L_t^2 H^{-\eta}_{comp}(\Omega)$ and we can apply Lemma 4.2 with $L^q(B_q) := L_t^4 \dot{W}^{1/4-\eta,4}(\Omega)$, $H := H^{1/2-\eta}(\Omega)$ and $L^r(B_r) := L_t^2 H^{-\eta}_{comp}(\Omega)$. This gives the first assertion in (4.12). Let us deal now with $(1-\chi)u$ which is solution to

$$(i\partial_t + \Delta_D)((1-\chi)u) = (1-\chi)|u|^{2+2\eta}u + [\chi, \Delta]u, \tag{4.14}$$

where Δ denotes the free Laplacian (notice that we can consider (4.14) in the whole space $\mathbb{R}^3$ since both source terms vanish near the boundary $\partial\Omega$). The commutator term is dealt with exactly as in the previous part and is therefore in $L_t^2 L^2_{comp}(\Omega)$.

Let $v := (1-\chi_1)u$ for some $\chi_1 \in C_0^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ such that $(1-\chi_1)^p = 1-\chi$. In order to prove (4.12) we only need to prove $|v|^{2+2\eta}v \in L_t^2 \dot{B}^{1/2-\eta,2}_{6/5}(\Omega)$, since then we may apply the dual end-point Strichartz estimates (from the $\mathbb{R}^3$ case) on the nonlinear term. Using the embedding $\dot{B}^{1-\eta,2}_1(\Omega) \subset \dot{B}^{1/2-\eta,2}_{6/5}(\Omega)$, it suffices to get $|v|^{2+2\eta}v \in L_t^2 \dot{B}^{1-\eta,2}_1(\Omega)$. When evaluating the product $|v|^{2+2\eta}v$ we will use for one factor v the energy bound and Sobolev embedding, $L_t^\infty H_0^1(\Omega) \subset L_t^\infty \dot{B}^{1-\eta,2}_q(\Omega)$ with $\frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\eta}{3}$. On the other hand, from our a priori bound from [16], we have $v \in L_t^4 L^4(\Omega)$, while $v \in L_t^\infty H_0^1(\Omega) \subset L_t^\infty L^6(\Omega)$ and hence $v^{1+\eta} \in L_t^{4/(1+\eta)} L^{4/(1+\eta)}(\Omega) \cap L_t^\infty L^{6/(1+\eta)}(\Omega)$. Interpolation with weights $1/(1+\eta)$ and $\eta/(1+\eta)$ gives $v^{1+\eta} \in L_t^4 L^{12/(3+2\eta)}(\Omega)$. Consequently,

$$\||v|^{2+2\eta}v\|_{L_t^2 \dot{B}^{1/2-\eta,2}_{6/5}(\Omega)} \lesssim \||v|^{2+2\eta}v\|_{L_t^2 \dot{B}^{1-\eta,2}_1(\Omega)} \lesssim \|v\|_{L_t^\infty \dot{B}^{1-\eta,2}_q(\Omega)} \||v|^{1+\eta}\|^2_{L_t^4 L^{12/(3+2\eta))}(\Omega)}.$$

This achieves the proof of Proposition 4.2. □

Remark 4.4. *One should point out that the proof of this last estimate is slightly incorrect, as it conveniently ignores the situation where low frequencies are on the v factor and high frequencies are on $|v|^{2+2\eta}$. This can be easily fixed by revisiting the proof of Lemma 4.9 and 4.10 in the Appendix, noticing that we may suppose that factors f there are in several different L^r spaces and distribute them when using Hölder on the low frequencies in the proofs. The same situation occurs several times in the present proof and we leave details to the reader.*

The next iterative step will be the following lemma:

Proposition 4.3. *Let u be a solution to the nonlinear problem* (2.2)*. Then*

$$u \in L_t^4 \dot{W}^{1/4+\eta,4}(\Omega) \cap L_t^2 H^{1+\eta}_{comp}(\Omega). \tag{4.15}$$

Proof. The split of the equation into equations for χu and $(1-\chi)u$ is no longer of any use: the resulting commutator source term is no better than $[\chi, \Delta]u \in L_t^2 L^2_{comp}(\Omega)$. However we now have estimates from Proposition 4.2 which turn out to be good enough that splitting the nonlinear term in (2.2) in two parts, using the partition $\chi + (1-\chi) = 1$ will allow us to use the somewhat restricted set of inhomogeneous estimates we have for the equation on a domain. Setting $g_1 := \chi|u|^{2+2\eta}u$, $g_2 := (1-\chi)|u|^{2+2\eta}u$ and using Duhamel formula, we have

$$u(t,x) = e^{it\Delta_D}u_0 + \int_0^t e^{i(t-s)\Delta_D} g_1(s)ds + \int_0^t e^{i(t-s)\Delta_D} g_2(s)ds\,; \tag{4.16}$$

the idea is then that one may use (4.9) on the g_1 Duhamel term, while the g_2 term may be handled in $L^1_t(\dot H^s)$ for a suitable s.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $v := (1-\chi_1)u$, where $\chi_1 \in C^2_0(\mathbb{R}^3)$ is such that $(1-\chi_1)^p = 1-\chi$. We have*

$$g_2 \in L^2_t \dot B^{1/2,2}_{6/5}(\Omega) \quad \textit{and} \quad v \in L^2_t \dot B^{1/2,2}_{6}. \tag{4.17}$$

Moreover, $g_2 \in L^1_t(\dot H^{\frac12+\eta}(\Omega))$ and

$$\Big\| \int_0^t e^{i(t-s)\Delta_D} g_2(s)ds \Big\|_{L^4_t \dot B^{1/4+\eta,2}_4(\Omega)\cap L^2_t H^{1+\eta}_{comp}(\Omega)} \lesssim \|g_2\|_{L^1_t(\dot H^{\frac12+\eta}(\Omega))}. \tag{4.18}$$

Proof. From Proposition 4.2, the energy and mass bound, and interpolation, we have

$$v \in L^2_t \dot W^{1/2-\eta,6}(\Omega) \cap L^\infty_t(\dot H^{\frac12-\eta}(\Omega) \subset L^4_t L^q(\Omega) \quad \text{for} \quad \frac1q = \frac16 + \frac\eta3,$$

hence $|v|^{1+\eta} \in L^{4/(1+\eta)}_t L^{q/(1+\eta)}(\Omega) \cap L^\infty_t L^{6/(1+\eta)}(\Omega)$. We now interpolate again and obtain $|v|^{1+\eta} \in L^4_t L^r(\Omega)$, where $\frac2r = \frac13 + \eta$. Therefore, the nonlinear term $g_2 = |v|^{2+2\eta}v$ belongs to $L^2_t \dot B^{1-3\eta,2}_{6/5}(\Omega)$. Indeed, let $\frac1m = \frac12 + \frac2r = \frac56 + \eta$, then

$$\|g_2\|_{L^2_t \dot B^{1-3\eta,2}_{6/5}(\Omega)} \lesssim \|g_2\|_{L^2_t \dot B^{1,2}_m(\Omega)} \lesssim \|v\|_{L^\infty_t \dot H^1_0(\Omega)} \||v|^{1+\eta}\|^2_{L^4_t L^r(\Omega)}. \tag{4.19}$$

If $1-3\eta \geq 1/2$, (4.17) follows, but unfortunately this covers only $\eta \leq 1/6$. It remains to deal with the situation $\eta \in (1/6, 1/5]$. In this case we use the equation satisfied by v (obtained by replacing χ by χ_1 in (4.14)) to get

$$v \in L^2_t \dot B^{1-3\eta,2}_6(\Omega). \tag{4.20}$$

In fact, the commutator term $[\chi_1, \Delta]u$ is in $L^2_t L^2(\Omega)$ and, consequently, it also belongs to $L^2_t H^{1/2-3\eta}(\Omega)$ since in this case $1/2 - 3\eta < 0$, while $(1-\chi_1)|v|^{2+2\eta}v \in L^2_t \dot B^{1-3\eta,2}_{6/5}(\Omega)$ as shown before. Therefore, with $1 - 3\eta - 3/r = 2(1-3\eta) - 1$,

$$v|v| \in L^1_t \dot B^{1-3\eta,2}_r(\Omega) \subset L^1_t \dot B^{1-6\eta,2}_\infty(\Omega). \tag{4.21}$$

In order to estimate g_2 we use (4.21) for a factor $v|v|$, while for the remaining factor $|v|^{1+2\eta}$ we use $v \in L^\infty_t H^1_0(\Omega)$, which yields

$$|v|^{1+2\eta} \subset L^\infty_t \dot{B}^{1,2}_\lambda(\Omega) \subset L^\infty_t H^{1-\eta}(\Omega) \quad \text{for} \quad \frac{1}{\lambda} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\eta}{3}. \tag{4.22}$$

From (4.21), (4.22) and product rules, we get $g_2 \in L^1_t H^{2-7\eta}(\Omega) \subset L^1_t H^{1/2}(\Omega)$ (notice that the regularity is $1-\eta-(6\eta-1)$ where $6\eta - 1 > 0$).

Using the equation satisfied by v and Duhamel formula we can write

$$v(t,x) = e^{it\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^3}}(1-\chi_1)u_0 + \int_0^t e^{i(t-s)\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^3}}(g_2 + [\chi_1, \Delta]u)(s)ds. \tag{4.23}$$

Using Lemma 4.1 with $L^q(B_q) := L^2_t \dot{B}^{1/2,2}_6(\Omega)$, $L^r(B_r) := L^1_t H^{1/2}(\Omega)$, the first term in the integral in the right hand side of (4.23) belongs to $L^2_t \dot{B}^{1/2,2}_6(\Omega)$. Using Lemma 3.1, we also obtain

$$\| \int_0^t e^{i(t-s)\Delta}[\chi_1, \Delta]u(s)ds\|_{L^2_t \dot{B}^{1/2,2}_6(\Omega)} \lesssim \|[\chi_1, \Delta]u\|_{L^2_t L^2_{comp}(\Omega)}.$$

Finally, the linear evolution $e^{it\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^3}}(1-\chi_1)u_0$ is evidently in $L^2_t \dot{B}^{1/2,2}_6(\Omega)$ and we obtain (4.17).

Remark 4.5. *For the last part of the proof of Lemma 4.3 we shall use less information than that, precisely we only need the fact that for $\epsilon > 0$ small enough we have*

$$v \in L^2_t \dot{B}^{1/2-\epsilon,2}_6(\Omega) \subset L^2_t(L^{\frac{3}{\epsilon}}(\Omega)) \subset L^2_t \dot{B}^{-\epsilon,\infty}_\infty(\Omega), \tag{4.24}$$

and $|v| \in L^{\frac{3}{\epsilon}}(\Omega) \subset L^2_t \dot{B}^{-\epsilon,\infty}_\infty(\Omega)$ as well.

We refine our knowledge on $g_2 = v|v|v^{1+2\eta}$: using the previous remark, we now have $v|v| \in L^1_t \dot{B}^{-2\epsilon,\infty}_\infty(\Omega)$. From (4.22) we also have $|v|^{1+2\eta} \in L^\infty_t \dot{B}^{1,2}_\lambda(\Omega)$ if $\lambda = \frac{6}{3+2\eta}$. Thus, the source term g_2 can be estimated as follows

$$\|g_2\|_{L^1_t H^{1-\eta-2\epsilon}(\Omega)} \lesssim \|g_2\|_{L^1_t \dot{B}^{1-2\epsilon,2}_\lambda(\Omega)} \lesssim \|v|v|\|_{L^1_t \dot{B}^{-2\epsilon,\infty}_\infty(\Omega)} \||v|^{1+2\eta}\|_{L^\infty_t \dot{B}^{1,2}_\lambda(\Omega)}. \tag{4.25}$$

Using again Lemma 4.1, this time with $L^q(B_q) := L^4_t \dot{B}^{3/4-\eta-2\epsilon,2}_4(\Omega)$, $H := H^{1-\eta-2\epsilon}(\Omega)$ and $L^r(B_r) := L^1_t H^{1-\eta-2\epsilon}(\Omega)$, we get by interpolation

$$\begin{aligned}\| \int_0^t e^{i(t-s)\Delta} g_2(s)ds\|_{L^4_t \dot{B}^{1/4+\eta,2}_4(\Omega)} &\lesssim \| \int_0^t e^{i(t-s)\Delta} g_2(s)ds\|^\theta_{L^4_t B^{3/4-\eta-2\epsilon,2}_4(\Omega)} \|u\|^{1-\theta}_{L^4_{t,x}} \\ &\lesssim \|g_2\|_{L^1_t H^{1-\eta-2\epsilon}(\Omega)} + \|u\|_{L^4_{t,x}}; \end{aligned} \tag{4.26}$$

where for the first (interpolation) inequality in (4.26) we used that $3/4 - \eta - 2\epsilon > 1/4 + \eta$ if ϵ is sufficiently small (take $0 < \epsilon \leq 1/20$ for example).

On the other hand, by Lemma 4.2 again,

$$\| \int_0^t e^{i(t-s)\Delta} g_2(s)ds \|_{L_t^2 H^{1+\eta}_{comp}(\Omega)} \lesssim \|g_2\|_{L_t^1 H^{1/2+\eta}(\Omega)} \lesssim \|g_2\|_{L_t^1 H^{1-\eta-2\epsilon}(\Omega)}, \tag{4.27}$$

which finally achieves the proof of Lemma 4.3. □

It remains now to deal with the Duhamel term coming from g_1 in (4.16).

Lemma 4.4. *Suppose that we know moreover that*

$$u \in L_t^4 \dot{B}^{\sigma,2}_4(\Omega), \quad \textit{where} \quad \sigma = \frac{1}{4} + \frac{\eta}{1+\eta}, \tag{4.28}$$

then

$$g_1 \in L_t^{4/3} \dot{B}^{3/4+\eta}_{4/3}(\Omega) \quad \textit{and} \quad \int_0^t e^{i(t-s)\Delta_D} g_1(s)ds \in L_t^4 \dot{B}_4^{1/4+\eta,2} \cap L_t^2 H^{1+\eta}_{comp}(\Omega). \tag{4.29}$$

Taking the lemma for granted, we can complete the proof of Proposition 4.3: using Lemmas 4.3, 4.4, the fact that the linear flow is in $L_t^\infty H_0^1(\Omega) \cap L_t^2 H^{3/2}_{comp}(\Omega)$ and Duhamel formula (4.16), estimate (4.15) follows immediately.

Proof. (of Lemma 4.4): The a-priori information (4.28) gives

$$u \in L_t^4 \dot{B}^{\sigma,2}_4(\Omega) \subset L_t^4 L^q(\Omega) \quad \text{for} \quad \frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{4} - \frac{\sigma}{3},$$

and consequently $u^{2(1+\eta)} \in L_t^{2/(1+\eta)} L^{3/(1-\eta)}(\Omega)$. On the other hand, interpolating between $L_t^2 H^1_{comp}(\Omega)$ and $L_t^\infty H_0^1(\Omega)$ gives $\chi u \in L_t^r H^1_{comp}(\Omega)$ for every $r \in [2, \infty]$. Therefore, with $\chi_1^p = \chi$, we can estimate

$$\|\chi |u|^{2+2\eta} u\|_{L_t^{4/3} \dot{B}^{1,2}_M} \lesssim \|\chi_1 u\|_{L_t^{4/(1-2\eta)} H^1_{comp}(\Omega)} \|u^{2+2\eta}\|_{L_t^{2/(1+\eta)} L^{3/(1-\eta)}(\Omega)}, \tag{4.30}$$

where $\frac{1}{M} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1-\eta}{3} = \frac{5}{6} - \frac{\eta}{3}$. It remains to notice that for M defined above, the embedding $\dot{B}^{1,2}_M(\Omega) \subset \dot{B}^{3/4+\eta,2}_{4/3}(\Omega)$ holds (indeed, $1 > 3/4 + \eta$ and $1 - 3/M = 3/4 + \eta - 9/4$) and to use again Lemmas 4.2, 3.1. Another application of Lemma 4.2 with $L^q(B_q) := L_t^2 H^{1+\eta}_{comp}(\Omega)$, $H := H^{1/2+\eta}_{comp}(\Omega)$ and $L^r(B_r) := L_t^{4/3} \dot{B}^{3/4+\eta,2}_{4/3}(\Omega)$ achieves the proof of (4.29) and Lemma 4.4. □

End of the proof of Proposition 4.3: In order to complete the proof of Proposition 4.3 it remains to prove that (4.28) holds indeed, since we have used it to deduce (4.15). Let $0 < T < \infty$ be small enough, so that by the local existence theory (see [16]) the $L_T^4 \dot{B}^{\sigma,2}_4(\Omega)$ norm of u is finite; in fact, the same can be said with σ replaced by $\eta + \frac{1}{4}$. We shall prove that $T=\infty$ is allowed. For this, we interpolate between $L_t^4\dot{B}_4^{1/4-\eta,2}(\Omega)$ and $L_T^4\dot{B}_4^{1/4+\eta,2}(\Omega)$ with interpolation exponent $\theta=\frac{\eta}{2(1+\eta)}$ to obtain an estimate on the $L_T^4\dot{B}_4^{\sigma,2}(\Omega)$ norm, where $\sigma=1/4+\eta/(1+\eta)$:

$$\|u\|_{L_T^4\dot{B}_4^{\sigma,2}(\Omega)}\leq\|u\|^{\theta}_{L_t^4\dot{B}_4^{1/4-\eta,2}(\Omega)}\|u\|^{1-\theta}_{L_T^4\dot{B}_4^{1/4+\eta,2}(\Omega)}. \tag{4.31}$$

Recall that from Proposition 4.2 we have now a uniform bound,

$$\|u\|_{L_t^4\dot{B}_4^{1/4-\eta,2}(\Omega)}\lesssim C(E,M), \tag{4.32}$$

and from Lemma 4.3 we consequently also have a uniform bound on the Duhamel part coming from g_2, see (4.18). Finally, using (4.29) for g_1 and the uniform bounds we already have for the linear part and the g_2 part,

$$\|u\|_{L_T^4\dot{B}_4^{1/4+\eta,2}(\Omega)}\lesssim C_1(E,M)+C_2(E,M)\|\chi u\|^{1/2-\eta}_{L_t^2H^1_{comp}(\Omega)}\|u\|^{2(1+\eta)}_{L_T^4\dot{B}_4^{\sigma,2}(\Omega)}. \tag{4.33}$$

Plugging (4.32), (4.33) in (4.31) yields

$$\|u\|_{L_T^4\dot{B}_4^{\sigma,2}(\Omega)}\leq C_3(E,M)+C_4(E,M)\|\chi u\|^{\gamma}_{L_t^2H^1_{comp}(\Omega)}\|u\|^{\rho}_{L_T^4\dot{B}_4^{\sigma,2}(\Omega)}, \tag{4.34}$$

where $\rho,\gamma>0$. The coefficients are uniformly bounded, and a splitting time argument performed on the $L_t^2H^1_{comp}(\Omega)$ norm which is finite provides global in time control of u in $L_t^4\dot{B}_4^{\sigma,2}(\Omega)$. This finally completes the proof of Proposition 4.3. □

Remark 4.6. *The space $L_t^4(\dot{B}_4^{\sigma,2}(\Omega))$ with $\sigma=\frac{1}{4}+\frac{\eta}{1+\eta}$ does not show up by accident: rather, it is a scale invariant space with respect to the critical regularity s_p. As such, it makes sense that it plays a pivotal role in the argument. Having reached (and in fact, gone beyond) critical scaling in our a priori estimates, the remaining part of the argument is somewhat less involved.*

At this point of the proof, we could establish scattering in the scale-invariant Sobolev space; however we want to reach H_0^1. Recall that we may write

$$\|u(t,x)-e^{it\Delta_D}(u_0+\int_0^{+\infty}e^{-is\Delta_D}|u|^{p-1}u(s)ds)\|_{H_0^1}=\|\int_t^{+\infty}e^{i(t-s)\Delta_D}|u|^{p-1}u(s)ds\|_{H_0^1},$$

from which we wish to use Duhamel to get

$$\|\int_t^{+\infty}e^{i(t-s)\Delta_D}|u|^{p-1}u(s)ds\|_{H_0^1}\lesssim\|g_1\|_{L^{4/3}(t,+\infty;\dot{B}^{5/4,2}_{4/3}(\Omega))}+\|g_2\|_{L^1(t,+\infty;H_0^1(\Omega))}, \tag{4.35}$$

from which scattering easily follows (the same argument applies at $t=-\infty$ as well).

Therefore we focus on the right handside and start with the easiest part, which is g_2.

Lemma 4.5. *We have* $g_2 = (1-\chi)u^p \in L^1_t H^1_0(\Omega)$.

Proof. We start by proving that

$$v = (1-\chi_1)u \in L_t^{2(1+\eta)} L^\infty(\Omega). \tag{4.36}$$

Remark 4.7. *Notice that if we have* (4.36) *the proof is finished since then*

$$\|v|v|^{2+2\eta}\|_{L^1_t H^1_0(\Omega)} \leq \||v|^{2(1+\eta)}\|_{L^1_t L^\infty(\Omega)} \|v\|_{L^\infty_t H^1_0(\Omega)}. \tag{4.37}$$

We proceed with (4.36). From Lemma 4.3 we know that $g_2 \in L^1_t H^{1-\eta}(\Omega)$ and $[\chi, \Delta_D]u \in L^2_t H^\eta_{comp}(\Omega)$, so using again the equation for $(1-\chi)u$ and Lemma 4.2,

$$(1-\chi)u \in L^2_t \dot{B}^{1-\eta,2}_6(\Omega)\big(\cap L^\infty_t H^1_0(\Omega)\big). \tag{4.38}$$

Recall that from Lemma 4.3 we also have $v \in L^2_t \dot{B}^{1/2,2}_6 \cap L^\infty_t H^{1/2}(\Omega)$. The Lemma now follows by interpolation and the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality (a similar key step exists in [16]). □

Lemma 4.6. *We have* $g_1 = \chi u^p \in L^{4/3}_t \dot{B}^{5/4,2}_{4/3}(\Omega)$.

Proof. We first prove

$$u \in L_t^{8(1+\eta)} L^{8(1+\eta)}(\Omega). \tag{4.39}$$

Indeed, from Propositions 4.2, 4.3 and interpolation, we get $u \in L^4_t \dot{B}^{1/4+\eta/2,2}_4(\Omega)$. Interpolating again between this bound and the energy bound $u \in L^\infty_t H^1_0(\Omega)$, followed by Sobolev embedding yields (4.39). Now we write

$$\|g_1\|_{L^{4/3}_t \dot{B}^{5/4,2}_{4/3}(\Omega)} \lesssim \|\chi u\|_{L^2_t H^{5/4}_{comp}(\Omega)} \|u^{2+2\eta}\|_{L^4_t L^4(\Omega)}, \tag{4.40}$$

and also by the Duhamel formula and the local smoothing estimate on the domain,

$$\|u\|_{L^2_t H^{5/4}_{comp}(\Omega)} \leq \|u_0\|_{H^{3/4}(\Omega)} + \|g_1\|_{L^{4/3}_t \dot{B}^{1,2}_{4/3}(\Omega)} + \|g_2\|_{L^1_t H^{3/4}(\Omega)}. \tag{4.41}$$

Certainly, using Lemma 4.5, the g_2 term is bounded. For g_1, we may write

$$\|g_1\|_{L^{4/3}_t \dot{B}^{1,2}_{4/3}(\Omega)} \lesssim \|\chi u\|_{L^2_t H^1_{comp}(\Omega)} \|u^{2+2\eta}\|_{L^4_t L^4(\Omega)}; \tag{4.42}$$

and we have reached a point where our right handside is uniformly bounded. Consequently the Lemma is proved, and this concludes the proof of Theorem 2.3. □

Appendix

In order to perform the various product estimates, we need a couple of useful lemma. Observe that with the spectral localization one cannot take advantage of convolution of Fourier supports. As a first step and in order to avoid cumbersome notations, we only consider functions and Besov spaces which do not depend on time. We will then explain how to re-instate the time dependance in the nonlinear estimates.

It is worth noting at this stage, however, that both Δ_j and S_j operators are well-defined on $L^p_t L^q_x$ and $L^q_x L^p_t$ for all the pairs (p,q) to be considered: this follows from [14] for the case $L^p_t L^q_x$ where the time norm is harmless. In the case $L^q_x L^2_t$, the arguments from [14] apply as well (heat estimates are proved for data in $L^p_x(H)$ where H is an abstract Hilbert space, and when $H = L^2_t$, the heat kernel is diagonal and therefore Gaussian as well). By interpolation and duality we recover all pairs (p,q).

Remark 4.8. *In $\mathbb{R}^n$, one may perform product estimates in an easier way because of the convolution of Fourier supports. However, when dealing with non integer power-like nonlinearities, one cannot proceed so easily: the usual route is to use a characterization of Besov spaces via finite differences; here, because of the Banach valued Besov spaces, we perform a direct argument which is directly inspired by computations in [15], where the same sort of time-valued Besov spaces were unavoidable.*

Lemma 4.7. *Let f_j be such that $S_j f_j = f_j$, and $\|f_j\|_{L^p} \lesssim 2^{-js}\eta_j$, with $s > 0$ and $(\eta_j)_j \in l^q$. Then $g = \sum_j f_j \in \dot{B}^{s,q}_p$.*

We have, by support conditions,

$$g = \sum_k \Delta_k \sum_{k<j} S_j f_j.$$

Now,

$$\|\Delta_k(\sum_{k<j} S_j f_j)\|_p \lesssim 2^{-ks} \sum_{k<j} 2^{-s(j-k)}\eta_j,$$

which by an $l^1 - l^q$ convolution provides the result.

Lemma 4.8. *Let f_j be such that $(I - S_j) f_j = f_j$, and $\|f_j\|_{L^p} \lesssim 2^{-js}\eta_j$, with $s < 0$ and $(\eta_j)_j \in l^q$. Then $g = \sum_j f_j \in \dot{B}^{s,q}_p$.*

We have, by support conditions,

$$g = \sum_k \Delta_k \sum_{k>j} (I - S_j) f_j.$$

Now,

$$\|\Delta_k(\sum_{k>j}(I-S_j)f_j)\|_p \lesssim 2^{-ks}\sum_{k<j}2^{-s(j-k)}\eta_j,$$

which by an l^1-l^q convolution provides the result.

Lemma 4.9. *Consider $\alpha=1$ or $\alpha\geq 2$, $f\in \dot{B}^{s,q}_p$ and $g\in L^r$, with $0<s<2$, $\frac{1}{m}=\frac{\alpha}{r}+\frac{1}{p}$: let*

$$T^\alpha_g f=\sum_j (S_j g)^\alpha \Delta_j f.$$

Then

$$T^\alpha_g f\in \dot{B}^{s,q}_m.$$

We split the paraproduct $T^\alpha_g f$:

$$T^\alpha_g f=\sum_j S_j((S_jg)^\alpha\Delta_j f)+\sum_j (I-S_j)((S_jg)^\alpha\Delta_j f);$$

the first part is easily dealt with by Lemma 4.7. For the second one, $K_g f$, taking once again advantage of the spectral supports

$$\Delta_k K_g f=\Delta_k\sum_{j<k}(I-S_j)((S_jg)^\alpha\Delta_j f).$$

Notice the situation is close to the one in Lemma 4.8, but we don't have a negative regularity for summing. We therefore derive

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_D K_g f &= \sum_{j<k}(I-S_j)\Delta_D((S_jg)^\alpha\Delta_j f)\\
&= \sum_{j<k}(I-S_j)\left(\Delta_D(S_jg)^\alpha\Delta_j f+(\Delta_D\Delta_j f)(S_jg)^\alpha+2\alpha(S_jg)^{\alpha-1}\nabla S_jg\cdot\nabla\Delta_j f\right)\\
&= \sum_{j<k}(I-S_j)\left(\alpha\Delta_D S_jg(S_jg)^{\alpha-1}\Delta_j f+\alpha(\alpha-1)|\nabla S_jg|^2(S_jg)^{\alpha-2}\Delta_j f\right.\\
&\quad\left.+(\Delta_D\Delta_j f)(S_jg)^\alpha+2\alpha(S_jg)^{\alpha-1}\nabla S_jg\cdot\nabla\Delta_j f\right).
\end{aligned}$$

The first two pieces are again easily dealt with with Lemma 4.8, and the resulting function is in $\dot{B}^{s-2,q}_m$. The remaining cross term is handled with some help from [14]:

$$\nabla\Delta_j f=\nabla\exp(4^{-j}\Delta_D)\tilde{\Delta}_j f,$$

where the new dyadic block $\tilde{\Delta}_j$ is built on the function $\tilde{\psi}(\xi)=\exp(|\xi|^2)\psi(\xi)$. From the continuity properties of $\sqrt{s}\nabla\exp(s\Delta_D)$ on L^p, $1<p<+\infty$, we immediatly deduce

$$\|\nabla\Delta_j f\|_p\lesssim 2^j\|\tilde{\Delta}_j f\|_p, \tag{4.43}$$

and we can easily sum and conclude. This will be enough to deal with the critical case, but for differences of nonlinear power-like mappings, we need

Lemma 4.10. *Consider $\alpha \geq 3$, $f, g \in X = \dot{B}^{s,q}_p \cap L^r$, with $0 < s < 2$, $\frac{1}{m} = \frac{\alpha-1}{r} + \frac{1}{p}$: Then, if $F(x) = |x|^{\alpha-1}x$ or $F(x) = |x|^\alpha$,*

$$\|F(u) - F(v)\|_{\dot{B}^{s,q}_m} \lesssim \|u - v\|_X (\|u\|_X^{\alpha-1} + \|v\|_X^{\alpha-1}).$$

In order to obtain a factor $u - v$, we write

$$F(u) - F(v) = (u - v) \int_0^1 F'(\theta u + (1 - \theta)v) d\theta. \tag{4.44}$$

We need to efficiently split this difference into two paraproducts involving $u - v$ and $F'(w)$ with $w = \theta u + (1 - \theta)v$, and this requires an estimate on $F'(w)$: write another telescopic series

$$\begin{aligned} F'(w) =& \sum_j F'(S_{j+1}w) - F'(S_j w) \\ =& \sum_j S_j(F'(S_{j+1}w) - F'(S_j w)) + \sum_j (I - S_j)(F'(S_{j+1}w) - F'(S_j w)) \\ =& S_1 + S_2. \end{aligned}$$

Exactly as before, the first sum S_1 is easily disposed of with Lemma 4.7, as

$$|F'(S_{j+1}w) - F'(S_j w)| \lesssim |\Delta_j w|(|S_{j+1}w|^{\alpha-2} + |S_j w|^{\alpha-2}).$$

The second sum S_2 requires again a trick; to avoid uncessary cluttering, we set $F(x) = x^\alpha$, ignoring the sign issue (recall that $\alpha \geq 3$, hence $F'''(x)$ is well-defined as a function): we apply Δ_D, let $\beta = \alpha - 1 \geq 2$

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_D S_2 =& \sum_j (I - S_j) \Delta_D ((S_{j+1}w)^{\alpha-1} - (S_j w)^{\alpha-1}) \\ =& \sum_j (I - S_j) \left(\beta (S_{j+1}w)^{\beta-1} \Delta_D S_{j+1} w - \beta (S_j w)^{\beta-1} \Delta_D S_j w \right. \\ & \left. + \beta(\beta - 1)(S_{j+1}w)^{\beta-2} (\nabla S_{j+1} w)^2 - \beta(\beta - 1)(S_j w)^{\beta-2} (\nabla S_j w)^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

We now apply Lemma 4.8 after inserting the right factors: we have four types of differences,

$$\begin{aligned} |((S_{j+1}w)^{\beta-1} - (S_j w)^{\beta-1}) \Delta_D S_{j+1} w| &\lesssim C_\beta |\Delta_j w| |\Delta_D S_{j+1}| (|S_{j+1}w|^{\beta-2} + |S_j w|^{\beta-2}) \\ |(S_{j+1}w)^{\beta-1} \Delta_D \Delta_j w| &\leq |\Delta_D \Delta_j w| |S_{j+1}w|^{\beta-2} \\ |((S_{j+1}w)^{\beta-2} - (S_j w)^{\beta-2})(\nabla S_{j+1} w)^2| &\lesssim \tilde{C}_\beta |\Delta_j w|^{\beta-2} |\nabla S_{j+1} w|^2 \\ |(S_{j+1}w)^{\beta-2}((\nabla S_j w)^2 - (\nabla S_{j+1} w)^2)| &\leq |\nabla \Delta_j w| (|\nabla S_j w| + |\nabla S_{j+1} w| |S_{j+1} w|^{\beta-2} \end{aligned}$$

where on the third line we wrote the worst case, namely $2 \leq \beta < 3$ (otherwise the power of $\Delta_j w$ in the third bound will be replaced by $|\Delta_j w|(|S_j w|^{\beta-3} + |S_{j+1}w|^{\beta-3})$).

By integrating, applying Hölder and using (4.43) to eliminate the ∇ operator, we obtain as an intermediary result

$$F'(w) \in \dot{B}^{s,q}_{\lambda}, \quad \text{with } \frac{1}{\lambda} = \frac{\alpha-2}{r} + \frac{1}{p}.$$

We may now go back to the difference $F(u) - F(v)$ as expressed in (4.44) and perform a simple paraproduct decomposition in two terms to which Lemma 4.9 may be applied. Observe that there is no difficulty in estimating $F'(w)$ in $L^{m/(\alpha-1)}$, and that the integration in θ is irrelevant. This completes the proof.

We now go back to the first nonlinear estimate, namely (4.2). We write a telescopic series for the product five factors $u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4, u_5 \in X_T$,

$$u_1u_2u_3u_4u_5 = \sum_j S_{j+1}u_1S_{j+1}u_2S_{j+1}u_3S_{j+1}u_4S_{j+1}u_5 - S_ju_1S_ju_2S_ju_3S_ju_4S_ju_5$$

and we are reduced to studying five sums of the same type, of which the following is generic

$$S_1 = \sum_j \Delta_j u_1 S_j u_2 S_j u_3 S_j u_4 S_j u_5,$$

and we intend to apply Lemma 4.9, which is trivially extended to a product of several factors. In principle,

$$u_k \in \dot{B}^{1,2}_5(L_T^{\frac{20}{11}}) \cap L_x^{\frac{20}{3}} L_T^{40}$$

is enough, using the first space of the Δ_j factor and the second one for all remaining S_j factors, except for the use of (4.43) in the proof. Consider, from $u \in X_T$,

$$2^{\frac{11}{10}j}\|\Delta_j u\|_{L_x^5 L_T^2} + 2^{-\frac{3}{2}j}\|\partial_t \Delta_j u\|_{L_T^5 L_x^5} = \mu_j^0 \in l_j^2.$$

We will have, using [14],

$$2^{\frac{11}{10}j}\|\nabla\Delta_j u\|_{L_x^5 L_T^2} + 2^{-\frac{3}{2}j}\|\partial_t \nabla\Delta_j u\|_{L_T^5 L_x^5} = \mu_j^1 \in l_j^2, \text{ with } \|\mu^1\|_{l^2} \lesssim \|\mu^0\|_{l^2}.$$

By Gagliardo-Nirenberg in time, we have the correct estimate for $\Delta_j u$, for $k = 0, 1$

$$2^{(1-k)j}\|\nabla^k \Delta_j u\|_{L_x^5 L_T^{\frac{20}{11}}} \lesssim \mu_j^k.$$

We proceed with the low frequencies by proving a suitable Sobolev embedding.

Lemma 4.11. *Let $u \in \dot{B}^{\frac{1}{2},5}_5(L_T^5)$ and $\partial_t u \in \dot{B}^{-\frac{3}{2},5}_5(L_T^5)$. Then $u \in L_x^{\frac{20}{3}} L_T^{40}$.*

Let

$$2^{(\frac{1}{2}-k)j}\|\nabla^k\Delta_j u\|_{L^5_x L^5_T} + 2^{-(k+\frac{3}{2})j}\|\partial_t\nabla^k\Delta_j u\|_{L^5_T L^5_x} = \mu^k_j \in l^5_j,$$

notice we can easily switch time and space Lebesgue norms. Using Gagliardo-Nirenberg in time, we have

$$2^{(\frac{1}{6}-k)j}\|\nabla^k\Delta_j u\|_{L^5_x L^{30}_T} \lesssim \mu^3_j \in l^5_j. \tag{4.45}$$

Using now Gagliardo-Nirenberg in space, we also have

$$2^{-\frac{j}{10}}\|\Delta_j u\|_{L^\infty_x L^5_T} \lesssim 2^{-\frac{j}{10}}\|\Delta_j u\|_{L^5_T L^\infty_x} \lesssim \mu^5_j$$

and the same thing for $2^{-2j}\partial_t\Delta_j u$ (or with an additional $2^j\nabla$). Now another Gagliardo-Nirenberg in time provides

$$2^{-(k+\frac{1}{2})j}\|\nabla^k\Delta_j u\|_{L^\infty_{T,x}} \lesssim \mu^6_j. \tag{4.46}$$

Finally, we take advantage of a discrete embedding between l^1 and weighted l^∞ sequences:

$$\begin{aligned}
|u| &\le \sum_{j<J}|\Delta_j u| + \sum_{j\ge J}|\Delta_j u| \\
&\le \sum_{j<J} 2^{\frac{j}{2}} \sup_j 2^{-\frac{j}{2}}|\Delta_j u| + \sum_{j\ge J} 2^{-\frac{j}{6}} \sup_j 2^{\frac{j}{6}}|\Delta_j u| \\
&\lesssim 2^{\frac{J}{2}} \sup_j 2^{-\frac{j}{2}}|\Delta_j u| + 2^{-\frac{J}{6}} \sup_j 2^{\frac{j}{6}}|\Delta_j u| \\
|u|^4 &\lesssim \sup_j 2^{-\frac{j}{2}}|\Delta_j u| \left(\sup_j 2^{\frac{j}{6}}|\Delta_j u|\right)^3 \\
\||u|^4\|_{L^{\frac{5}{3}}_x L^{10}_T} &\lesssim \|\sup_j 2^{-\frac{j}{2}}|\Delta_j u|\|_{L^\infty_{T,x}} \|\sup_j 2^{\frac{j}{6}}|\Delta_j u|\|^3_{L^5_x L^{30}_T} \\
\|u\|_{L^{\frac{20}{3}}_x L^{40}_T} &\lesssim \|u\|\|^{\frac{1}{4}}_{\dot B^{\frac{1}{2},\infty}_\infty (L^\infty_t)} \|u\|\|^{\frac{3}{4}}_{\dot B^{\frac{1}{6},5}_5 (L^{30}_t)}
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that the estimate with a gradient is much easier: just interpolate between (4.45) and (4.46) with $k = 1$ to obtain

$$2^{-j}\|\nabla\Delta_j u\|_{L^{\frac{20}{3}}_x L^{40}_T} \lesssim \mu^7_j,$$

which we can now sum over $k < j$ to obtain control of $S_j u$.

The case $p < 5$ is handled in an similar way, and we leave the details to the reader, sparing him the complete set of exponents (depending on p !) that would appear in the proof. For scaling reasons there is actually no need to perform the computation: the previous one on the critical case simply illustrates that we can sidestep issues related to the usual Littlewood-Paley theory by using direct arguments.

References

[1] Ramona Anton. Global existence for defocusing cubic NLS and Gross-Pitaevskii equations in three dimensional exterior domains. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 89(4):335–354, 2008.

[2] N. Burq, P. Gérard, and N. Tzvetkov. On nonlinear Schrödinger equations in exterior domains. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 21(3):295–318, 2004.

[3] Nicolas Burq. Estimations de Strichartz pour des perturbations à longue portée de l'opérateur de Schrödinger. In *Séminaire: Équations aux Dérivées Partielles. 2001–2002*, Sémin. Équ. Dériv. Partielles. École Polytech., Palaiseau, 2002.

[4] Nicolas Burq, Gilles Lebeau, and Fabrice Planchon. Global existence for energy critical waves in 3-D domains. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 21(3):831–845, 2008.

[5] Nicolas Burq and Fabrice Planchon. Smoothing and dispersive estimates for 1D Schrödinger equations with BV coefficients and applications. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 236(1):265–298, 2006.

[6] Nicolas Burq and Fabrice Planchon. Global existence for energy critical waves in 3-d domains : Neumann boundary conditions, 2007. to appear in Amer. J. of Math., `arXiv:math/0711.0275`.

[7] Thierry Cazenave and Fred B. Weissler. The Cauchy problem for the critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation in H^s. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 14(10):807–836, 1990.

[8] Michael Christ and Alexander Kiselev. Maximal functions associated to filtrations. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 179(2):409–425, 2001.

[9] J. Colliander, M. Keel, G. Staffilani, H. Takaoka, and T. Tao. Global well-posedness and scattering for the energy-critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation in $\mathbb{R}^3$. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 167(3):767–865, 2008.

[10] J. Ginibre and G. Velo. The global Cauchy problem for the nonlinear Schrödinger equation revisited. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 2(4):309–327, 1985.

[11] Oana Ivanovici. Precise smoothing effect in the exterior of balls. *Asymptot. Anal.*, 53(4):189–208, 2007.

[12] Oana Ivanovici. Counter example to Strichartz estimates for the wave equation in domains, 2008. to appear in Math. Annalen, `arXiv:math/0805.2901`.

[13] Oana Ivanovici. On the Schrodinger equation outside strictly convex obstacles, 2008. `arXiv:math/0809.1060`.

[14] Oana Ivanovici and Fabrice Planchon. Square function and heat flow estimates on domains, 2008. `arXiv:math/0812.2733`.

[15] Fabrice Planchon. Dispersive estimates and the 2D cubic NLS equation. *J. Anal. Math.*, 86:319–334, 2002.

[16] Fabrice Planchon and Luis Vega. Bilinear virial identities and applications. *Ann. Scient. Éc. Norm. Sup.*, 42:261–290, 2009.

[17] Hart F. Smith and Christopher D. Sogge. On the critical semilinear wave equation outside convex obstacles. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 8(4):879–916, 1995.

[18] Hart F. Smith and Christopher D. Sogge. On the L^p norm of spectral clusters for compact manifolds with boundary. *Acta Math.*, 198(1):107–153, 2007.

[19] Gigliola Staffilani and Daniel Tataru. Strichartz estimates for a Schrödinger operator with nonsmooth coefficients. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 27(7-8):1337–1372, 2002.